

SIDDHESWAR CHATTOPADHYAYA, M.A., D. PHIL.

nataka-laksana ratna-kosa

In the perspective of
Ancient Indian Drama and Dramaturgy




PUNTHI PUSTAK
CALCUTTA-4. INDIA



NĀṬAKA-LAKṢAṆA-RATNA-KOŚA

In the perspective of
Ancient Indian Drama & Dramaturgy





NATAKA-LAKSANA-RATNA-KOSA

In the perspective of
Ancient Indian Drama and Dramaturgy

SIDDHESWAR CHATTOPADHYAYA, M.A., D.Phil.,
Kāvyatirtha

*Reader in Sanskrit,
The University of Burdwan,
Burdwan.*



PUNTHI PUSTAK

Calcutta

::

1974


Published by
S. K. Bhattacharya
© Punthi Pustak
34 Mohan Bagan Lane
Calcutta-700004

First published 1974

Printed in India

by Santosh K. Bhattacharya at Sri Ramkrishna Printing Works,
19, S. N. Banerjee Road, Calcutta-700013

To
PIONEERS
In the Field of the Study of
INDIAN DRAMATURGY




FOREWORD

It is known to students of Sanskrit Literature that works on Sanskrit Poetics, written in different periods of Indian History, furnish evidence to indicate its growth and development. But the paucity of literature on Sanskrit dramaturgy is a stupendous stumbling block to a critical study of its development through the centuries. Though the Nāṭyaśāstra of Bharata is looked upon as the fountain source of matters relating to literature, both poetic and dramatic, yet it is unfortunate that an elaborate and adequate study and evaluation of topics on dramaturgy and its various problems is not available in subsequent works which are more or less anything but collections of matters of dramatic interest. It is, therefore that the present work of Dr. Siddheswar Chattopadhyaya will be read by scholars who have a genuine interest in Sanskrit drama and various problems concerned with it ;—its source, analysis, divisions of the plot and the like. Dr. Chattopadhyaya is well acquainted with dramatic technique in its various forms, being himself a finished actor of Sanskrit dramas. With his rich personal experience in the domain of histrionic art he has been able to throw light on many difficult issues. Dr. Chattopadhyaya has utilised the work of Sāgarānandin to his advantage.

I recommend the present book to all lovers of Sanskrit dramas.

Calcutta
August 1, 1973

GAURINATH SASTRI



ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Present work is the first part of a study ; the second, the last one waits completion.

It was my revered preceptor Dr Gaurinath Sastri who initiated me into the study of ancient Indian drama and dramaturgy, guided me in my research work and has also graced my book with a foreword from his pen. I find no language to express my gratitude adequately to him. I am specially indebted to my esteemed friend Dr Kalikumar Datta Sastri, Research Professor, Calcutta Sanskrit College. It was he who drew my attention to the Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa and helped me in every possible way by going through my writings, offering suggestions and clarifying many points through discussions. I am also grateful to my respected friend Dr Gobindagopal Mukhopadhyaya, Professor and Head of the Department of Sanskrit, Burdwan University. He had been taking a personal interest in the progress of the work. Lastly but nowise in the least, I am thankful to my learned friends of the Calcutta Sanskrit Sahitya Parishat ; but for their pursuation the present work could have neither been completed nor published.

My thanks are due to Sri Sankar Bhattacharyya, proprietor of "Punthi Pustak" who had to cross many-a hurdle in bringing out this book to the light of the day. He had even to change the press after first few formats were completed. Many thanks to the owner of the Sri Ramkrishna Printing Works who at last managed to produce this volume neatly.

I am glad to record my obligation to my students, Prof. Miss Archana Chaudhury and Miss Radharani Datta Ray, Research Scholar, who helped me in preparing the index.

In conclusion, I frankly admit of my inefficiency as a proof-reader. Moreover, due to some unforeseen reasons I could not even go through the proofs of first four formats. Corrigenda thus became necessary.

Burdwan
Mahalaya, 1973.

SIDDHESWAR CHATTOPADHYAYA

ABBREVIATIONS

Abhi. bhā.	= Abhinava-bhārati
Abhi-śaku.	= Abhiññāna-śakuntalam of Kālidāsa.
ABORI	= Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
Ag.	= Abhinavagupta.
Al. sa.	= Alaṅkāra-saṁgraha of Anṛtānanda-yogin.
Ar. dyo.	= Artha-dyotanikā of Rāghavabhaṭṭa.
An. rā.	= Anargha-rāghava of Murāri.
Bāl. rā.	= Bāla-rāmāyaṇa of Rājaśekhara.
Bhā. pra.	= Bhāva-prakāśana of Śāradātanaya.
Bhar. ko.	= Bharata Kośa.
BSOS.	= Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies.
CHCSL.	= A concise History of Classical Sanskrit Literature of Dr. G. Sastri.
Com.	= Commentary/commentator.
Dh. ā.	= Dhvanyāloka of Ānanda-varḍhana.
DR.	= Daśa-rūpaka of Dhanañjaya.
DSL.	= Drama in Sanskrit Literature of R.V. Jagirdar
Ed.	= Edited by/Editor/Edition.
Eng. Tra.	= English Translation.
f.	= Following.
f.n.	= Foot note.
GOS.	= Gaekwad's Oriental Series.
HSL.	= A History of Sanskrit Literature.
HSP.	= History of Sanskrit Poetics.
IHQ.	= Indian Historical quarterly.
Ind. Thea.	= Indian Theatre of C.B. Gupta.
J.A.	= Journal Asiatique, Paris.
JOI.	= Journal of the Oriental Institute, Baroda.
JOR.	= Journal of the Oriental Research Institute, Madras.

- Kā-ā. = Kāvyaadarśa of Daṇḍin.
 KM. = Kāvya-mālā Series.
 KSS. = Kashi Sanskrit Series
 Ku. mā = Kundamālā of Dinnāga.
 l./ll. = Line/Lines.
 LPSD. = The Lawas and Practice of Sanskrit Drama of
 S. N. Shastri.
 Mā.ag. = Mālavikāgnimitra of Kālidāsa.
 Mā.mā. = Mālatī-mādhava of Bhavabhūti.
 Mu-rā = Mudrā-rākṣasa of Viśākha-datta.
 Mṛ/Mṛccha. = Mṛcchakaṭika of Śūdraka.
 Mg. = Mātṛgupta.
 Nāgā. = Nāgānanda of Śrīharṣa.
 NC. = Nāṭaka-candrikā of Rūpa-gasvāmin.
 ND. = Nāṭya-darpaṇa of Rāmacandra-Guṇacandra.
 NLRK. = Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa of Sāgaranandin,
 Ed. M. Dillon.
 NŚ. = Nāṭya-śāstra.
 NSP. = Nirṇaya-sagara press.
 OH. = Our Heritage.
 PHAI. = Political History of Ancient India of Dr. H.
 Roychoudhury.
 PRYB. = Pratāpa-rudra-yaśo-bhūṣaṇa of Vidyānātha.
 Ra.ca. = Rasa-candrikā, commentary of Śaṅkara on
 Abhi-śaku.
 RB. = Rāghava-bhaṭṭa.
 RS. = Rasārṇava-sudhākara of Śiṅga-bhūpāla.
 R. t. = Rāja-taraṅgiṇī of Kahlana.
 R. V. = Ratnā-valī of Śrīharṣa.
 Saṅ-dā = Saṅgita-dāmodara of Śubhaṅkara.
 SCAS. = Some concepts of the Alaṅkāra Śāstra of V.
 Raghavan.
 SD. = Sāhitya-darpaṇa of Viśvanātha.
 Śdt. = Śāradātanaya.
 Sgn. = Sāgaranandin.
 SOLRP. = Some Old Lost Rama Plays of V. Raghavan.

Śr. pra.	= Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa of Bhoja.
SSP.	= Saṅskṛta-sāhitya-Pariṣat.
The Skt. Dr.	= The Sanskrit Drama of A.B. Keith.
Ṭi-sar.	= Ṭikā-sarvasva of Sarvānanda.
The TSS.	= The Theory of Sandhis and Sandhyāṅgas of T. G. Mainkar.
TSS.	= Trivandrum Sanskrit Series.
U. ca.	= Uttara-rāma-carita of Bhavabhūti.
VDP.	= Viṣṇu-dharmottara-purāṇa.
Vik. u.	= Vikramorvaśiya of Kālidāsa.
V. sam.	= Veṇi-saṃhāra of Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa.

Chronological position of some important writers and works on Indian dramaturgy, and commentators of dramas, accepted in the present work :—

<i>Nāṭya-śāstra</i> of Bharata	... C. 300 B.C.—300 A.D.	
<i>Abhinava-bhāratī</i> of Abhinava-gupta	... 980-1030	„
<i>Daśa-rūpaka</i> of Dhanañjaya	... 975-995	„
<i>Avaloka</i> of Dhanika	... C. 1000	„
<i>Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa</i> of Bhoja	... 1005-1054	„
<i>Nāṭya-darpaṇa</i> of Rāmacandra- Guṇacandra	... 1093-1175	„
<i>Bhāva-prakāśana</i> of Śāradātanaya	... 1175-1250	„
<i>Pratāpa-rudra-yaśo-bhūṣaṇa</i> of Vidyānātha	... 1275-1325	„
<i>Sāhitya-darpaṇa</i> of Viśvanātha	... 1300-1340	„
<i>Rasārṇava-sudhākara</i> of Śiṅgabhūpāla	... 1340-1360	„
<i>Nāṭaka-candrikā</i> of Rūpa-Gosvāmin	... 1470-1554	„
<i>Jagaddhara</i> (Com. <i>Mālatī-mādhava</i>)	... 14th cen.	„
<i>Kāṭyavema</i> (Com. on <i>Mālavikāgnimitra</i>)	... 1381-1416	„
<i>Rāghava-bhaṭṭa</i> (Com. on <i>Abhi-śaku</i>)	... 1475-1500	„
Śaṅkara and Narahari (Coms. on <i>Abhi-śaku</i>)	... C. 1500	„
Raṅganātha (Com. on <i>Vikramorvaśīya</i>)	... C. 1600	„
Dhūṇḍirāja (Com. on <i>Mudrā-rākṣasa</i>)	... 1713-14	„
Rucipati (Com. on <i>Anargha-rāghava</i>)	... C. 1600	„

CONTENTS

Foreword	...	VII
Acknowledgements	...	IX
Abbreviations	...	XI-XIII
Chronological position of works and authors		
accepted	...	XIV
Introduction	...	XXIII-XXXV

CHAPTER I

<i>Plot of the Sanskrit Drama : Qualitative Analysis</i> ...		1—15
Nāṭya and its eulogy—division of the Vastu— Prakhytā, Utpādyā and Miśra—view of the <i>Nāṭya-śāstra</i> —Māṭṛgupta's opinion—contempo- rary king as hero—views of Sāgara, Abhinava etc.—the view of Ghaṇṭaka and others—Udātta —four types of the hero.		

CHAPTER II

<i>Five Avasthā-s</i> ...		16—25
Māṭṛgupta's analysis—that according to the <i>Nāṭya-śāstra</i> —Ārambha—Prāyatna—Praptyāśā— Niyatāpti—Phalāgama.		

CHAPTER III

<i>Arthaprakṛti</i>		26—48
Formal division of the plot—Ādhikārika, Prā- saṅgika—three different views on the nature of Arthaprakṛti-s—critical analysis of the views.		
<i>Bija</i> ...		29—34
Meaning of Bija—its indication—view of an Ācārya and its implication—three types of the Bija according to Māṭṛgupta—exposition of the view—ways of the beginning of a Play.		
<i>Bindu</i> ...		34—38
Definition of Bindu - opinion of Kohala - other views - Bindu as pivotal idea - view of Abhinava - significance of the term.		

<i>Patākā</i>	38—43
Significance and definition of <i>Patākā</i> - <i>Patākā</i> nāyaka - ally of the enemy - <i>Upanāyaka</i> - achievement of the <i>Patākā-nāyaka</i> - extent of the <i>Patākā</i> in a play.				
<i>Prakarī</i>	44
Definition, extent and achievement of <i>Prakarī</i> - significance of the term.				
<i>Kārya</i>	44—48
<i>Kārya</i> as the end from different standpoints - as main purpose - two <i>kārya</i> -s - <i>Kārya</i> and <i>Phala</i> - <i>Kārya</i> as <i>Phala</i> -hetu - <i>Kārya</i> and <i>Phalāgama</i> - are all the <i>Arthaprakṛti</i> -s essential ?				

CHAPTER IV

<i>Sandhi</i>	49—92
Nature of <i>Sandhi</i> - want of the idea of three unities - unity of impression - fusion of <i>Sandhi</i> or <i>Sandhi</i> -s - reason - number of <i>Sandhi</i> -s in different types of play - essential <i>Sandhi</i> -s.				
<i>Mātrgupta's theory</i>	54—64
Exposition of the text is difficult - each <i>Sandhi</i> has got three aspects - <i>Mukha-sandhi</i> - <i>Prati-mukha-sandhi</i> - <i>Garbha-sandhi</i> - <i>Vimarśa-sandhi</i> - <i>Nirvahaṇa-sandhi</i> - originality of the theory - plot of the drama <i>Māyamadālasā</i> - the <i>Sādhyādi-pāñcaka</i> theory - its connection with <i>Sandhi</i> - wrongly attributed to <i>Mātrgupta</i> - utility of the methods.				
<i>Mukha-sandhi</i>	64—66
Definition - different views - origination of the <i>Bija</i> as the source of <i>Rasa</i> - <i>Bindu</i> with <i>Bija</i> - view of an <i>Ācārya</i> regarding the indication of <i>Bija</i> .				

Pratimukha-sandhi ... 66—70

Definition - *dr̥ṣṭa-naṣṭa* characteristic of the Bija in this Sandhi - opinion of Sāgara - six views referred to by Abhinava and that of his own - other views.

Garbha-sandhi ... 70-73

Definition - significance of the term Garbha - controversy over the meaning of the words *prāpti*, *aprāpti* and *anveṣaṇa* in Bharata's definition - different views.

Vimarśa-sandhi ... 73—78

Bharata's definition - significance of Vimarśa - different views referred to by Abhinava and Sāgara - other views - development of views - explanation of *sandeha*, *vimarśana* and *vighna*.

Nirvāhaṇa-sandhi ... 78—84

Definition - meaning of *artha* - chief characteristic - brief recapitulation of the course of action - eleventh-hour tragic complication - appearance of a god - Adbhuta-rasa at the concluding portion - shape of the composition like a cow's tail - conclusion.

Relation among the Three Pentads ... 84—91

Sāgaras silence - all the pentads in full are not essential in all types of plot - interrelation of the pentads - view of Abhinava and others - Avasthā and Sandhi related - View of Dhanañjaya and others - three pentads are correlated - inconsistency of Abhinava - absurdity of the view of Dhanañjaya and his followers - opinions of the commentators of plays - views of Bharata and other ancient writers - conclusion.

Anu-sandhi ... 91—92

CHAPTER V

<i>Sandhyaṅga-s</i>	93-130
<i>Āṅgas of the Mukha-sandhi</i>	92-97
" " " <i>Pratimukha</i>	97-103
" " " <i>Garbha</i>	103-108
" " " <i>Vimarśa</i>	108-115
" " " <i>Nirvahaṇa</i>	115-122
<i>Number, name and definitions of</i> <i>Sandhyaṅga-s</i>	122-124
<i>Applications of the Sandhyaṅga-s</i>	124-127
Order in their application—are all of them necessary - mechanical application.		
<i>Necessity and nature of the Sandhyaṅga-s</i>	127-130
They are not subdivisions of Sandhi-s - views of Bharata and others - new theory of Subandhu - tendency towards over elaboration and grouping.		

CHAPTER VI

<i>Sandhyantara-s (Pradeśa-s)</i>	131-135
Only names of twentyone <i>Sandhyantara-s</i> in the <i>Nāṭya-sāstra</i> - later authorities give little impor- tance - Sāgara first defines and illustrates each - their purpose - discrepancy in names - Mātr- gupta's view - Bharatan or post-Bharatan - evolution of their definitions.		

CHAPTER VII

<i>Patākā-sthānaka-s</i>	136-142
A dramatic artifice - definition - their number - two schools - a synthesis - exposition of the four <i>Patākāsthānaka-s</i> - they do not form the sub- sidiary portion of the plot - order in their use -		

relation between Patākā-nāyaka and Patākā-sthānaka - restriction on their use in a play.

CHAPTER VIII

<i>Division of the play for representation</i>	...	143—162
<i>Aṅka (Act)</i>	...	— 143-147
Meaning of the term - reading of Bharata's definition - opinions of Lollaṭa and Sāgara - number of Acts in a Nāṭaka - relation of Acts with Avasthā-Sandhi - divergent views - some minor characteristics of an Act.		
<i>What is and what is not permissible to be visibly represented in an Act</i>	...	147-155
View of the <i>Nāṭya-śāstra</i> - different interpretations - death-scene and Bhāsa plays - opinions of Sāgara and Abhinava - an old view supporting death-scene in an Act - death of the hero - some other items prohibited on stage - some items prohibited in theory but accepted in practice - standpoint of the <i>Nāṭya-śāstra</i> .		
<i>Duration of time covered by an Aṅka</i>	...	156-158
Different views - passing of a long time - Kārya-dina. <i>Other regulations</i>		
	..	160-162

CHAPTER IX

<i>Arthopakṣepaka</i>	163—190
<i>Praveśaka</i>	163-169
General purpose - introduces character of the next act - no character should enter without prior indication - other uses - characters to take part in it - view of Mātṛgupta and Sāgara - opinions of commentators - Udātta-vacana - position in the play - no regulation seems to be absolute.			

Viṣkambhaka ... 169-173

Twice defined in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* - its nature and function - a novel definition offered by Sāgara - meaning of the term - no essential difference between Praveśaka and Viṣkambhaka - its position - view of Kohala - it was first not related to the Nāṭaka.

Aṅkāvatāra (Garbhāṅka) ... 173-179

Sāgara's definition - transition of next Act though intervened by an interlude - Dhanñjaya admits of no intervention - confusing stand of Viśvanātha and Śāradātānāya - conflicting definitions in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and *Abhinava-bhāratī* - standpoint of Bhoja - appearance of the term Garbhāṅka - later it was not included in the Arthopakṣepaka-s.

Aṅkamukha. (Ankāśya) ... 179-183

Sāgara defines it as a *resume* of the leading ideas of the following acts - Abhinava takes it to be the definition of Aṅkāvatāra - opinion of Bharata - Viśvanātha gives two views - in all, two views are available - both are based on the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.

Cūlikā ... 183-184

indication of something from behind the screen - participants - Śiṅgabhūpāla's treatment of the topic.

A General review of the Arthopakṣepaka-s ... 185-190

Nāṭya-śāstra uses the term only once - authenticity of this verse and definitions of the five Arthopakṣepaka-s] in Chap. XIX of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* - view of Kohala who coined the term Arthopakṣepaka - Praveśaka and Viṣkambhaka are scenes - other three are not treated as scenes - they denote modes of the beginning of Acts -

real significance of the device - misinterpretation of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* by later theorists.

CHAPTER X

Title of the play ... 191—192

No regulation in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* - old practice - Sāgara's view - that of Śārādātanaya - views of Viśvanātha and Amṛtānanda and commentators.

Title of the Aṅka ... 193-196

Only Sāgara formulates a principle - all the names of Aṅka-s referred to by Viśvnātha and Śārādātanaya are found in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa* - necessity for the naming of Aṅka-s - staging of selected Acts - a perusal of the foregoing chapters.

CHAPTER XI

Vṛtti ... 197—229

Number of Vṛtti-s ... 197-202

Four Vṛtti-s of Bharata - theories of two and three Vṛtti-s - Udbhaṭa's scheme of Vṛtti - misrepresentation of the theory by Dhanañjaya and others - criticism by Lollaṭa and Abhinava - View of Bhoja - common view.

Characteristics of Vṛtti-s and Vṛttyaṅga-s ... 202-215

Forms of the four Vṛtti-s - critical assesment of different views.

Vṛtti and Rasa ... 215-221

Controversy regarding the distribution of Rasa-s to Vṛtti-s - root of all conflicting views - view of Sāgara - opinion of Kohala - standpoint of Abhinava - Rasa-s of the four Vṛtti-s - opinion of later theorists.

Vṛtti and Rīti ... 221-222

Three Rīti-s according to Sāgara - Bhārati is the Vṛtti of all Rasa-s and Rīti-s - particular Rīti is Bhārati qualified by a particular Vṛtti - three groups of Rasa-s and their relation with Rīti and Vṛtti.

Nature and mutual relation of the Vṛtti-s ... 223-229

Nature of Vṛtti - Abhinaya and its forms - their relation with the Vṛtti-s - Vṛtti-s are interdependant - root of the misconception in limiting Bhārati to Prologue only - evolution of Abhinaya - conclusion.

Notes and References

Bibliography

Index

INTRODUCTION

From my college days, I have all along been an ardent admirer of Sanskrit drama and an active participant in the production of and acting in Sanskrit plays. As a student and then as a teacher in the Under-Graduate and Post-Graduate classes, very often I came to be confronted with difficult problems concerning various topics of Sanskrit drama and dramaturgy. These problems could not be satisfactorily solved with the help of either the standard text-books like the *Daśa-rūpaka* and *Sāhitya-darpaṇa*, or the available commentaries of dramas. Though of much help in some cases, the commentaries do not mostly follow a definite school of thought but unhesitatingly quote divergent opinions from different sources and thus help little to form a definite concept. Their value as treasure house of quotations from lost works, however, cannot be ignored. My confusion became worse confounded when I made an attempt to compare the views of these works with those found in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and *Abhinava-bhāratī*. It is a common experience to every student of Sanskrit drama and dramaturgy that the commentators and later theorists profess an almost religious allegiance to the *Nāṭya-śāstra* while giving divergent and sometimes self-contradictory views on any topic. To name only a few, the theory of correlation of the three pentads (Avasthā, Sandhi and Arthaprakṛti) the nature of the five Arthopakṣepakas and their relation with the Aṅka, the significance of Vṛtti, the prohibitive injunctions against the representation on the stage of such incidents like death, marriage etc., are some such topics. The standard work of Dr A. B. Keith is inadequate to explain these problems like many others.

It is not our business to find out here the shortcomings of my fore runners in the field. With due respect to those scholars, it may be stated that none of the recent publications¹

could answer fully the problems raised in my mind or by my students. There had been no comprehensive and historical study of all the topics, related to the source, analysis and division of the plot of Sanskrit drama from different stand-points and according to divergent views. The technique, involved in the division of the play for representation and other allied topics have been discussed so long very casually. That the theory of Arthopakṣepaka had a history of development from a very simple state to a complex one, remained overlooked so long. For the first time, an attempt has been made here to have a comprehensive and critical study of all these topics.

So far as the available texts on dramaturgy are concerned there is a long gap of more than seven centuries between the *Nāṭya-śāstra* (C. 300 B.C. to 300 A.D.) and the *Abhinava-bhāratī* (A.D. 980-1030). But that this long period was not completely barren is brought home to us by the views discussed in the *Abhinava-bhāratī*, *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*, *Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa* and the *Bhāva-prakāśana* mainly. For a proper comprehension of the theories of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, it is imperative that all these works should be studied. Abhinava-gupta followed a particular school of thought in interpreting the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and almost at every step he referred to and criticised other views. Many of these views are found to be followed by Sāgara and it appears that he followed an earlier school of thought. Nowhere in the topics studied in the following chapters, Sāgara betrays any knowledge of the opinions of Abhinava-gupta specifically, excepting in cases where both agree.

In the following chapters the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* has been taken up as the starting point for a comprehensive study of the theories of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and their later developments. The work is neither a full commentary of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* like the *Abhinava-bhāratī* nor an independent treatise like the *Daśa-rūpaka*, *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* etc., nor is it a collection of all the current views with occasional attempts

of bringing about a synthesis among them, as the *Śrīgāra-prakāśa* and *Bhāva-prakāśana*. The portion of the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* with which we are concerned in the present study, is based on only a few chapters of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. It has been shown in the following chapters that almost in each case Sāgara quotes from the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and adds his comment, or describes a topic and then quotes from the *Nāṭya-śāstra* in his support. It has also been shown that wherever Sāgara's reading of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* differs from Abhinava-gupta's, the former finds support in one or other of the manuscript readings.

Sāgara refers to and comments on many views not found in the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, but those of Mātr̥gupta receive his special attention; where the latter differs from the most commonly accepted opinions, Sāgara sides with him and this has been shown in several cases in the following chapters. Following Mātr̥gupta, Sāgara admits only Sanskrit speaking characters as Viṭa, Tāpasa, Vipra etc., in a Praveśaka. Mātr̥gupta's novel theory of Sandhi-s, as found in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* has been fully explained and it has been shown that Mātr̥gupta's shorter method is but an alternative one and not a substitute of the elaborate method of Bharata and that the Sādhyādi-pāñcaka theory is most probably older than Mātr̥gupta to whom it is attributed by some scholars, other than Sāgara. Mātr̥gupta's opinion about the Sandhyantaras has also been fully discussed.

Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa "The gem-treasury of the views of dramaturgic text", makes us acquainted with some principles which are found to be generally followed by ancient dramatists. Some later theorists and commentators ascribes them to Bharata, but the principles are not found in the present versions of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.² An attempt has been made for the first time, to trace the roots of these principles and their implications.

In the following chapters, each topic as described in the

Nāṭya-śāstra has been studied independently and in the light of Sāgara's exposition. The view of Sāgara has been compared with that of Abhinava. In doing so, all the different views on any particular topic, as referred to by these two authorities have been discussed. To make the study thorough and comparative, the standpoints of the *Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa*, *Daśa-rūpaka*, *Nāṭya-darpaṇa*, *Bhāva-prakāśana*, *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* and the *Nāṭaka-candrikā* have been discussed. In some cases the *Pratāparudra-yaśobhūṣaṇa* and the *Alaṃkāra-saṃgraha* have also been consulted. In every case, however, attempt has been made to present a comparative study of the theories and their application in ancient dramas. In this connection the views of the commentators of dramas have been discussed. Attempts, wherever possible, have also been made to show chronological development of theories from the *Nāṭya-śāstra* to later commentators. In short, in the following pages the development of the theories concerning mainly with the plot of Sanskrit drama through ages has been studied in relation to the dramatic literature.

Most modestly this thesis can claim to have treated for the first time in the above method, some views of Mātṛgupta, the problem relating to the source of the plot of Nāṭaka and featuring of a contemporary hero therein, the actual implication of each member of the three pentads and their mutual relation and the evolution of the Sandhyantara-s. The nature of the individual Arthopakṣepaka-s has been explained fully (Chap. IX) and it has been shown that the original conception of this pentad was thoroughly misunderstood later and that the Aṅka itself was recognised by early theorists as an Arthopakṣepaka. Fresh light has been thrown on the topic of Sandhyaṅga-s, Patākāsthānaka-s the naming of plays and the Vṛtti-s. The history of the Sandhyantara-s, specially of their definitions has been traced. Under the topic "What is and what is not permissible to be visibly represented in an Act" the prohibitive injunctions of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* have been thoroughly discussed and it has been shown that the

spirit behind these injunctions has been overlooked in later texts and the variety of acts and incidents permissible to be visibly represented came to be curtailed more and more. Most of these topics had hitherto been discussed either very casually or giving more importance to later text books. The fact that there were different schools of thought, followed by dramatists and theorists had been overlooked. The *Nāṭya-śāstra* treats the science of dramaturgy in *extenso* and is undoubtedly based on a tradition which developed through centuries in ancient India. It acquired a sanctity, almost religious in character, in the dim past. The *sūtra*-like verses of the monumental treatise are amenable to different interpretations. So, the propounders of later school found no difficulty in maintaining divergent views and at the same time professing allegiance to the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. We have tried here to trace the origin of these schools as far as possible and to clarify their standpoints.

The *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* of Sāgara-nandin and its age.

The text of the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* used here is the solitary one that was edited by Professor Myles Dillon in 1937, from a single manuscript which was discovered by Professor Sylvain Lévi from the collection of the Rājaguru Hemrāja Śarmaṇ of Nepal. Professor Lévi published a report on the work in the *Journal Asiatique* (Vol. XCiii, October-December 1923). Several papers on the work were published by eminent scholars like P. K. Gode, M. R. Kavi and Dr V. Raghavan. Then in November, 1960 a translation of the text by Professor M. Dillon, revised by Dr Murray Fowler and Dr V. Raghavan with introduction, notes and amendments by the latter was published as a volume of *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, Philadelphia. Dr V. Raghavan has identified most of the illustrations quoted by Sāgara from a number of plays. His notes, amendments and identifications have proved to be very useful for our purpose of exposition and comparative study. There are, however, cases where we have failed to share the opinions of Dr Raghavan for which reasons have been given along with

our suggestions. Most gladly and frankly do I acknowledge my indebtedness to the above scholars. In a few cases, sources of illustrations from anonymous works have also been traced.

Besides many anonymous sources (referred to with such remarks as *tathāhi*, *anyeca*, *ācārya āha* etc.), Sāgara refers to a host of authorities on ancient Indian dramaturgy. The name of Bharata, however, tops the list.³ But it is significant that the name of Kohala is conspicuous by its absence. While describing the distribution of the Rasa-s among the four Vṛtti-s, Sāgara quotes a verse⁴ the third foot of which is ascribed to Kohala by Abhinava-gupta.⁵ The entire verse may thus be ascribed to Kohala. The editor of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* (GOS) informs us that one *mātrkā* support the reading of Kohala instead of that accepted by Abhinava and gives the whole verse⁶ which again tallies with the reading of Sāgara. It is to be noted here that there is no mention of Śānta-rasa in the verse and Sāgara also does not count that Rasa. But Sāgara ascribes the verse to Ācārya. In ten occasions Sāgara refers to his source as the saying of Ācārya, eight of which have been traced in the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.⁷ Another verse, attributed to Ācārya, describes the three ways of sowing the germ and seems to be taken from some lost version of the śāstra.⁸ In the present case also it may be presumed that Sāgara believed that the above verse distributing the Rasas among the Vṛttis was Bharata's. Mm. P. V. Kane opines, "It appears that Kohala's work influenced the redactors of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*". It is possible that the above verse was included in some version of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* long before Sāgara-nandin who had an access to that version and found no reason to suspect its authenticity. In our discussion on Bindu it has been shown that Sāgara seems to follow the view of Kohala, of course without mentioning his name. Besides these two cases any direct influence of Kohala is not found in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kosa*. There are many references to the name of Kohala in the *Abhinava-bhāratī*

and *Bhāva-Prakāśan*, Sāgara-nandin's silence in the matter is inexplicable.

It has been stated above that Sāgara gives more importance to the views of Mātr̥gupta. His work has not come down to us and it is a serious loss to any student of Indian dramaturgy. The *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* gives an account of one Mātr̥gupta who ruled for some years in Kashmir in the 7th cen. A.D., and was a celebrated literary figure and patron. It is generally believed that he wrote an independent treatise on dramaturgy in *anuṣṭubh* verses. Several verses from his work with his name are found to be quoted in the *Tikā-sarvasva* of Sarvānanda and the *Arthadyotanikā* of Raghava-bhaṭṭa. Raṅganātha and Vāsudeva give the definition of Sūtradhāra from the work of Mātr̥gupta. Śāradātanaya also refers to his views with and without mentioning his name.¹¹ But it is the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* from which we can have a real insight into Mātr̥gupta's originality and understanding of the art of dramaturgy. Special attention has been given here in dealing with the views of Mātr̥gupta and it has been shown that Sāgara also seems to have quoted some verses from the work of Mātr̥gupta without mentioning his name.¹² It may be pointed out in this connection that Abhinava who refers to the views of a host of ancient Indian theorists, quotes Mātr̥gupta only once and that is also on Puṣpa, a technical term for a particular way of the playing of the bīṇā.¹³ Abhinava's comparative silence about the views of Mātr̥gupta is also inexplicable. Subhāṅkara in his *saṅgita-dāmodara* quotes Mātr̥gupta's view on Sandhi but does not mention his name. It appears that he had no direct access to the work of Mātr̥gupta and took those verses from some other work, most probably the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa*.¹⁴ In any case, Mātr̥gupta's "work must have been available until recent times"¹⁵ as can be surmised from the quotations found in the late commentaries pointed out above. It is interesting to note that Rāghava-bhaṭṭa quotes verses of the *Nāṭya-sāstra* but attributes them to Mātr̥gupta¹⁶. Either Rāghavabhaṭṭa

is wrong or it may be presumed that some verses of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* were taken by Mātr̥gupta verbatim.

Prof. Sylvain Levi observes that Viśvanātha seems to have drawn extensively upon the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa* without acknowledgement.¹⁷ Dr. V. Raghavan substantiates this observation and points out that regarding the *Nāṭyālaṅkāras* the *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* be indebted to the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa*, but so far as the examples of the *Upa-rūpakas* and some other illustrations are concerned, Viśvanātha's indebtedness to Sāgara is certain. He also gives a concordance of passages common to the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa* and the *Bhāva-prakāśana* and observes that a close relation between these two works is undeniable and further shows that Bahurūpa-miśra knew the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*.¹⁸ It has been shown in the present discourse that all the names of Acts referred to in the *Bhāva-prakāśana* and in the sixth chapter of the *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* are found in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa*.¹⁹ Not only the names of Acts but the citations therefrom in the *Bhāva-prakāśana* (written between 1175-1250 A.D.) and in the *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* occur in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa* in similar contexts in almost all cases, whereas all the names of Acts found in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa* do not occur in the above two works. So, the indebtedness of *Śāradātanaya* and Viśvanātha to Sāgara-nandin seems to be undeniable. None of them, however, mentions the name of either the work or its author.

Śubhaṅkara, a Bengali theorist of the 15th century, names a *Ratna-kośa* in his *Saṅgīta-dāmodara* as one of his sources²⁰ and this *Ratna-kośa* is undoubtedly the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*. Most of the cases where Śubhaṅkara appears to be indebted to the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa* come under our discussion and have been noted in respective places. A concordance of passages common to the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* and the *Saṅgīta-dāmodara* is given here.²¹

- Saṅgīta-domodara* *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-hoṣa*
- (1) P. 16, ll. 18-19..... ll. 17-18, *rgbhyaḥ pāṭhyam abhūd gūtaṃ sāmabhyaḥ samapadyata| yajurbhyo' bhinayā jatā rasāścāhar-vaṇaḥ smṛtāḥ||* The verse contains what is said in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* (GOS) I. 17, but the reading is quite different.
- (2) P. 71, l. 16..... 1. 2167, *haritālādi sāmagrī maṣi saiva tu varṇikā |*
- (3) P. 72. *Kutopi svecchayā* etc. ll. 365. 366, (infra pp. 171)
- (4) P. 72. *asūcitasya pātrasya* etc. 1. 331, (infra pp. 163)
- (5) P. 73, ll. 4-5..... ll. 1045-1046, (infra p. 223)
- (6) P. 81. *devatā-darśanāntam* etc., 1. 389, (infra p. 82)
- (7) P. 97..... ll. 460-469, (infra View of Mātrgupta on Sandhis)
- (8) PP. 98-99..... ll. 925-929, 994-995, (infra Sandhyantaras)

Mr. M. R. Kavi has pointed out that Sarvānanda, Subhūti, Jātaveda, Kumbhakārṇa, Rāyamukuta and Jagaddhara have mentioned or quoted from the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*.²² Dr V. Raghavan, however, notices that Sarvānanda practically refers to *Ratnakōśa* the lexicon²³ which has been referred to by many including Śaṅkara and Narahari from Mithila. Mr M. R. Kavi of Jātaveda's borrowing cities, *śṛṅgāra-vīra* etc. *iti ratnakōṣe cakārāt śānto pi grhītaḥ*. But Sāgara-nandin enumerates the Rasas in a verse (fl. 1861-1862) where there is no *cakāra*. My esteemed friend Dr K. K. Datta Shastri informs me that Rāyamukuta actually quotes from the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*.²⁴ Among commentators of dramas Jagaddhara, Raṅganātha and Rucipati are stated to have drawn upon this work.²⁵ Raṅganātha cites Sāgara regularly by

name.²⁶ *Rasa-candrikā* and *Tippaṇi*, two commentaries on the *Abhijñāna-śakuntala* by Śaṅkara and Narahari respectively,²⁷ give clear evidences of their indebtedness to Sāgara-nandin. Both explicitly state the name *Ratnakosa*.²⁸ Most of their citations come under our discussion which have been pointed out in respective places. Thus, it appears that the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* came to be recognised as a standard work fit to be drawn upon by the writers and commentators beginning from the 13th century A.D.

In our discussion it has been shown in many places that Sāgara betrays no knowledge of the *Abhinava-bhārati* and the *Daśa-rūpaka*, whereas in several occasions Abhinava criticises the views held by Sāgara who seems to follow an older school. Mr. M. R. Kavi opines that the style of Sāgara is older than that of Abhinava. The *Viddhaśāla-bhaṇjikā* of Rājaśekhara (10th cen. A.D.) has been cited in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa* (1.3071) and this provides the upper limit of Sāgara's date. Mr M. R. Kavi and P. K. Gode²⁹ assert that Subhūticandra borrowed from the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa*. T. R. Cintamani, P. K. Gode and M. R. Kavi, all are of opinion that Subhūticandra was alive between 1062-1172 A.D.³⁰ Sarvānanda wrote his commentary in A.D. 1158-1159. The validity of the suggestion that he quotes from the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa* has been challenged by Dr V. Raghavan, as stated above. He, however, admits that the two passages where Sarvānanda and Sāgara illustrate the three types of Śṛṅgāra are very close to each other, though the contexts are different.³¹ The closeness is so intimate that it suggests the borrowing of one from the other. Sarvānanda refers to the name *Ratnakosa*. So, the suggestion that he quotes from the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* cannot be ruled out altogether though no conclusive evidence is available. From all these it appears that Sāgara-nandin cannot be placed below the 11th century A.D.

NOTES

1. Most important recent publications are :— The Lawas and practice of Sanskrit Drama (1961) by Dr. S. N. Shastri, The Theory of the Sandhis and Sandhyaṅgas (1960) by Dr. T. G. Mainkar. The Conception of Sandhis in the Sanskrit Drama by Dr. V. M. Kulkarni (JOI. Vol. V) is a brilliant paper. So far as the method of treatment is concerned, I am glad to confess my indebtedness to Dr. Kalikumar Dutta Sastri. His two highly learned papers, Prologues and Epilogues in Sanskrit Drama and Pūrvaraṅga, (OH. Vol. V, Pt. I ; Vol. IX, Pt. I) give a comprehensive and historical study of the topics. In this respect Dr. V. Raghavan (then a researcher) showed the way in his illuminating discourse on Vṛtti in J. O. R., Madras, 1932-33.

2. Cf. infra, the different ways of *bīja-nyāsa* (chap. Bīja), the prohibition regarding the entrance of a character without being previously indicated (Chap. on Praveśaka), the distinguishing mark between the Praveśaka and Viṣkambhaka.

3. For the list of names of authorities cited or used in the NLRK. see the NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 71.

4. NLRK. II. 1059-1062. This one has been taken into account in our discourse on Vṛtti, Chap. XIX.

5. NS. GOS. Vol. II. p. 452.

6. NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 105, the *mātrikā bha.*

7. Cf. the text of the NLRK. below II. 133, 333, 355, 535, 905, 912, 1394. 2778], NS. (GOS) respectively XIX. 20-21, XVIII. 34-35, XVIII. 37, XIX. 39, XIX. 104-106, XVIII. 42 XXII. 33, XVIII. 45.

8. NLRK. below I. 548. For elaborate discussion see infra chap. III, Bīja. It may be noted here that at least in one case Sgn. attributes a verse (NLRK. below I. 2409) to the sage Bharata which is not found in the present NS.

9. Mm. P. V. Kane, HSP. p. 24. The point has been discussed in Chap. VIII. B., particularly below "A general review of the Arthapakṣepakas".

10. Vik-u, p. 6, *Karpūramañjarī*, p. 5 *Koṇeśvari-ṭikā* on Vik-u (ABORI. Vol. 38, Pts. III-IV edited by H. D. Velankar) also quotes a verse of Mg. on *tenā-giti*. p. 286.

11. Bhā-pra. p. 234, l. 22. mentions the name of Mg., but in p. 216, ll. 9-10, Śdt. refers to the view of Mg. without mentioning his name.

12. Infra f.n. 40, below the Sandhyaṅga Karaṇa.

13. Mm. P. V. Kane, HSP, p. 54.

14. Infra, Chap. IV, below Nirvahana-sandhi of Mātr-gupta.

15. Dr. Raghavan, NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 7.

16. Infra Chap. VII, f.n. 16 below fourth Pataḥsthānaka.

17. Journal Asiatique, Octobre—December, 1923, p. 211.

18. Journal of the University of Gauhati, Vol. III, 1952, pp. 29-33.

19. Infra chap. X, Title of the Aṅka. For date of Śdt. see the Introduction of the Bhā-pra. pp. 73-77., Mm. P. V. Kane, HSP. p. 439.

20. Sañ-dā. p. 1.

21. In "Sources and References" (Sañ-dā pp. 125-136) the learned editors have pointed out (1) (6) (7) and (8) of the above agreements, and the (1) is said (Sañ-dā. p. 127) to be quoted in the *Bhaktiratnākara*.


22. A Volume of Indian and Iranian Studies presented to Sir E. Denison Ross, 1939, Date of Sāgaranandin, pp. 198-205.

23. NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 6

24. Calcutt Sanskrit College Research Series, Commentary of Rāyamukūṭa, in Press.

25. Cf. papers of Prof. Levi and Mr. M. R. Kavi, referred to above and also the Introduction of the NLRK. by Prof. M. Dillon. In our discussions some other cases of agreement have been noted in proper places.

26. Cf. Vik-u., Ed. K. P. Parab, Second edition. 1897, pp. 4, 7, 14, 16, 17, 21, 23, 26, 55, 65, 126.
27. The two commentaries, edited by Ramnath Jha, have been published in a single volume by the Mithila Institute, Darbhanga.
28. See *infra* Chap. I, f. n. 19.
29. M. R. Kavi's paper referred to above f.n. 22, Kuppuswami Sastri commemoration volume. Subhūticandra, p. 49.
30. (i) ABORI, Vol. XVI. pts 3-4, pp. 313-314, Subhūti's commentary on the *Amarkośa*—P. K. Gode.
ii) Kuppuswami Sastri commemoration volume, pp. 47-51, Subhūticandra,—P.K. Gode.
iii) JOR., Madras, Vol. VIII. 1934, Pt. IV, pp. 372-380, Subhūticandra's Commentary on *Amarakośa*,—T. R. Chintamani.
31. NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 6.



CHAPTER I

Plot of the Sanskrit Drama

Qualitative analysis

Sanskrit rhetorecians use the term Kāvya to denote all sorts of the poetical compositions. Kāvya may either be *abhināya* (*dṛśya*) or *śrava* the former comprises all types of dramatic compositions which are primarily meant to be enacted and are appropriately designated as *rūpa*, *rūpaka*¹ or *nāṭya* while the latter includes all other varieties of Kāvya which are meant to be read, recited and heard.²

“*Nāṭya* is imitation,” says Sāgara-nandin³ and in support of his view quotes :

avasthā yā tu lokasya sukhaduḥkha-samudbhavā /
*tasyāstvabhinayaḥ Prājñair-nāṭyamityabhidhīyate*⁴ //

Here *Nāṭya* has been used in the sense of dramatic representation. It is the *abhinaya* (imitation on the stage, i.e., dramatic representation) of states or situations of human life arising out of joy and sorrow.⁵ Through fourfold *abhinaya* (*āṅgika*, *vācika*, *sāttvika* and *āhārya*) the characters portrayed in drama are represented on the stage. The term *abhinaya*, according to Sāgara owes its origin to the fact that it brings the events, depicted in the drama, before the eyes of the audience and makes out the meaning of the composition.⁶

Nāṭya has been highly eulogised by Bharata and later authorities alike. It is as sacred as the fifth Veda⁷ and its different elements are said to be taken from different Vedas.⁸ It is also the highest of all arts to comprise in itself all sorts of knowledge and learning⁹ and gives pleasure to all without any distinction of caste and creed. In praise of Nāṭaka Sāgara quotes the following verse from an anonymous source :

api śakyeta vidvadbhir-muktir-abhyāsa-kausālāt /
*na tu nāṭaka-vidyeyam sarvalokānu-rāñjani*¹⁰ //

It is interesting to note that the verse, attributed by Śaṅkara to no less an authority than Prajāpati himself, places *nāṭakavidyā* even above *parā-vidyā* in India where *mokṣa* has been universally proclaimed as the highest end of human life. This single verse amply demonstrates the reverence with which ancient Indian critics took up drama and dramaturgy.

The richness of Sanskrit drama can be comprehended from the list of names of the types of *rūpakas*. The *Nāṭya-śāstra* though it speaks of ten *rūpakas* describes eleven types of *rūpakas* including the *Nāṭikā*. The *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa* and some other works deal with the *upa-rūpakas* also.

Of these *rūpakas* *Nāṭaka* and *Prakarāṇa* are recognised as full-fledged drama with all the five *Sandhis* and four *Vṛttis*. Between these two, Indian dramaturgy accepts *Nāṭaka* as the main type. Sāgara like all other authorities on *Nāṭaka* first for the treatment of his subject and institutes interesting discussions on the qualitative analysis of the plot of drama, for the proper comprehension of which some preliminary observations are necessary.

In Sanskrit dramaturgy the plot of a play is variously called as *vastu*, *ākhyāna*, *itivṛtta*, *itihāsa*, *kathā* and *saṃvidhānaka*.¹¹ In the *Nāṭya-śāstra* the theme of a drama has been described as its body.¹² Now, from the standpoint of qualitative analysis, later authorities beginning from Dhanañjaya are of opinion that plots are of three kinds: the renowned, invented and mixed. When the plot is derived from the mythological or historical (*itihāsa-purāṇa*) sources. It is renowned (*prakhyāta*). The plot is said to be invented (*utpādya* or *kalpya*) if it is a creation of the poet's own imagination. The mixed type of plot (*miśra*) is partly invented and partly derived from historical or mythological source.¹³ This type is derived but refashioned or remodelled by the poet to suit his purpose. As a general rule, the invented story cannot form the subject-matter of a *Nāṭaka*. The *Nāṭaka-candrikā* is most vocal on this point and says, *kṛpta-varjyaṃ tu nāṭake*.¹⁴ Plays of *Prakarāṇa*, *Prakarāṇikā*, *Prahasana* and *Vithi* types have their plots invented by the poet. The plot of a *Nāṭaka* should always be renowned (*khyāte*).

vytta). Abhinava-gupta informs us that according to his preceptor, the quality of being *prakhyāta* for a story depends upon threefold renownedness. The hero of the story himself, his activities and the country he lives in,—all are required to be famous.¹⁵

The above threefold division of the plot is undoubtedly of later origin. The *Nāṭya-śāstra* nowhere has explicitly divided the plot as renowned, invented and mixed. From description of the different types of dramas, it appears that the *Nāṭya-śāstra* recognises only two kinds of plot : *prakhyāta* and *utpādyā*, to be taken up for different types of drama. Both in theory and practice all sorts of stories found a place in the rich dramatic literature in India. But the best or the highest type of drama i.e., the Nāṭaka has been restricted to deal with the stories found in the two Great Epics, the Purāṇas and the *Bṛhatkathā*, and these works have all along been accepted as the perennial source of the themes of Nāṭakas in India.

Sāgara quotes from the *Nāṭya-śāstra* the description of Nāṭaka which says that the theme of a Nāṭaka should be famous ; it should be related to the renowned activities of famous and noble heroes belonging to the families of royal sages and having divine supports or having divine sources.¹⁶ By families of royal sages Sāgara means Lunar and Solar dynasties¹⁷ and adds that the renowned activities are those that are *lokānām-anurañjanam karma*. Rāma's determination in carrying out father's command, his heroic discharge of duty in slaying Rāvaṇa to avenge the wrongs done by the latter through the abduction of Sītā and also difficult tasks like the offering of own body by Jīmūtavāhana have been cited as illustrations of renowned activities of the heroes.¹⁸

Regarding the quality of the plot of a Nāṭaka Sāgara remarks :

*nāṭakasyetivṛttaṃ bhavati upāttaṃ prati-saṃskṛtaṃ ca/
Upāttaṃ purāṇa-siddhaṃ rūmādi-vṛttāntaḥ | Pratisaṃskṛtaṃ
upāttaṃ kevalaṃ kavinaḥ kimcid-utpādyā-vastviti muni-vacanāt
prapañcitam* |¹⁹

Thus, according to Sāgara the plot of a Nāṭaka, though taken from any traditional source, can be refashioned by the poet and this is explained by the observations of the *Muni*. But who is this *Muni* according to whose view the plot of a Nāṭaka can be reshaped from its original form? The *Nāṭya-sāstra* is quite silent regarding the matter. Bharata categorically neither gives nor denies the liberty of the poets in refashioning the plots of Nāṭakas.

In actual practice, however, it is found that all our renowned Nāṭakas are based upon stories the frameworks of which are borrowed from traditional sources, but nowhere the story is represented as it is found in its original source. In every case it is *Prati-samskrta*, refashioned.

Historically speaking, Nāṭaka had its beginning in some crude and simple form of *rūpaka* like *Dima* and *Samavakāra* but gradually developed through ages into *Pūrṇa-sandhi* and *Pūrṇa-vṛtti* Nāṭaka proper.²⁰ At the primary stage, it can be presumed that simple and short stories in their original form from the epics and Purāṇas were sufficient to meet the demands of drama. But in a full-fledged drama like Nāṭaka those stories were required to be elaborated and refashioned. The poets took the liberty of remodelling the plots to give them proper shape of Nāṭaka and to make them more appealing to the audience. Thus, in every extant Nāṭaka we find that the plot as a whole is *pratisamskrta*.

Among the texts on dramaturgy, the *Bhāva-prakāśa* only informs us that it is Mātṛguptācārya who enjoins that the plot of a Nāṭaka, though taken from a traditional source can be refashioned by the poet.²¹ This statement of Śāradātanaya is attested by a quotation from the text of Mātṛgupta found in *Arthadyotanikā*, a commentary on *Abhijñāna-sakuntala* by Rāghava-bhaṭṭa. Dr. Raghavan points out that Sāgara directly borrows here the view of Mātṛgupta.²² It thus appears that Sāgara here refers to Mātṛgupta by the word *muni*, who keeping an eye on the actual practice of the day, enjoins the right of the poet in reshaping the plot of Nāṭaka the framework of which is to be borrowed from the traditional source.

For various reasons Mātṛgupta's description of Nāṭaka as quoted by Rāghava-bhaṭṭa is interesting. It says :—

1. *Prakhyāta-vastu-viśayam dhīrodāttādi-nāyakaṃ/*
2. *rājarṣi-vamśa-caritaṃ tathā divyā-śrayānvitam/|*
3. *yuktaṃ Vṛddhi-vilāsādyair-guṇair-nānāvibhūtibhiḥ/*
4. *śṛṅgāra-vīrā-nyatara-pradhāna-rasaśrayam/|*
5. *prakṛtyavasthā-sandhyāṅga-sandhyantara-vibhūṣaṇaiḥ/*
6. *patākā-sthānakair-vṛttaṃ patāṅgaiśca (tadāṅgaiśca ?)*
pravṛttibhiḥ/|
7. *nāṭyā-laṅkaranair-nānā-bhāṣā-yuk-pātra-saṃcayaiḥ/*
8. *aṅka-praveśakair-āḍhyaṃ rasa-bhāva-samujjvalam/|*
9. *sukha-duḥkhotpatti-kṛtaṃ Caritaṃ yastu bhūbhṛtām/*
10. *itīvṛttaṃ kathod-bhūtaṃ kiṃcid-utpādyā-vastu ca/|*
11. *nāṭakaṃ nāma taj-jñeyam rūpakaṃ nāṭya-vedibhiḥ/|²³*

It is evident that Sāgara directly borrows the expression *kiṃcid-utpādyā-vastu* from the tenth line of the above quotation. Taking into consideration the actual practice, as discussed above, the texts of Mātṛgupta and Sāgara may be interpreted to mean that the plot of a Nāṭaka is to be borrowed and at the sametime may be refashioned, *upātta* and *pratisaṃskṛta*, in this sense indicate two characteristics of the plot and imply that though the framework of the plot of a Nāṭaka should always be related to the achievements of the epic or purāṇic heroes yet the poet is free to handle it in a manner suitable to his own purpose. Siṅgabhūpāla accepts this principle and says that the theme of a Nāṭaka should be *khyātetī-vṛtta-sambaddha*²⁴ (connected with some renowned story), allowing thereby the scope of refashioning. The *Daśa-rūpaka* allows, this scope of the poet in clever terms and shows the reason. It says that the poet is free to discard or change the incidents in the life of the hero, as depicted in the source, which are not in conformity with the desired Rasa, or go against the merits of hero. The *Bhāva-prakāśana* and the *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* reiterate the same. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* also maintains the same. Several instances from existing Nāṭakas have also been cited by Dhanika to show how poets very often take the liberty of changing and rejecting incidents of the lives of heroes as described in original sources.²⁵ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa*

seems to be more practical in stating that the poets, while depicting traditional stories, freely innovate new situations and reject old ones for the sake of making the Nāṭaka more attractive to the audience.²⁶

It may be added here that all the works on Indian dramaturgy pay unconditional respect to Bharata and profess to follow him. The present *Nāṭya-śāstra* also acquired a sanctity, almost religious in character, centuries before the days of Abhinava-gupta. It may be presumed that had there been no support of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, at least an implicit one, no theorist could have stated so explicitly that the epic and purāṇic stories could be refashioned by the poets. Abhinava-gupta's silence also on the matter cannot be explained otherwise. Similar was the position of the playwrights. Without the sanction of a *ṛṣi*, possibly none could have remodelled an *ārṣa*-story for fear of hurting the feelings of at least the orthodox section of audience. On the otherhand, remodelling of traditional stories was a practical necessity for the avoidance of boring repetitions. Thus both theorists and playwrights sought for an *ārṣa* sanction which they certainly derived from the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. It will not be out of place to point out here that a simple epic story, depicted in its original form in a Nāṭaka, cannot be expected to portray diversities of prosperity, amorous pastimes and so forth, as demanded by the *Nāṭya-śāstra* itself.²⁷ Thus, it will not be unjustified to conclude that the *Nāṭya-śāstra* implicitly supports the general practice of remodelling traditional stories in Nāṭakas.

Dr Raghavan says, "Themes are of three kinds, Renowned, Invented and Mixed ; *Prakhyāta*, *Utpādyā* and *Misra*" and about *upātta* and *pratisaṃskṛta* of the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa*, he remarks. "These are two subdivisions of the first type of the plot, the *Prakhyāta*.²⁸" But Sāgara does not divide the plot into *prakhyāta*, *utpādyā* and *misra* kinds. Moreover, this division refers to the theme of drama in general and not of Nāṭaka only. Like all other authorities Sāgara maintains that the invented story forms the theme of *Prakaraṇa* etc. It appears then that according to Sāgara also, plots of dramas are of three kinds, *upātta*, *pratisaṃskṛta* and *utpādyā* corres-

ponding respectively with *prakhyāta*, *miśra* and *utpādyā* of others. Thus *upātta* and *pratisaṃskṛta* cannot be taken as two subdivisions of *prakhyāta*.

Sāgara further maintains that even the lives of historical or contemporary kings may form the subject matter of Nāṭaka. This view deserves special treatment, as it is opposed to that commonly held and finds support from no other authority excepting Śāradātanaya who declares :

prayojana-vaśāt-tat-tu vartamānam api kvacit |²⁹

This is the gist of Sāgara's statement :

*vartamānam-api-nṛpater-mahābhūtasya kavi-buddhi-prakarṣād-āśāditabija-bindvādikaṃ yadi bhavati bhavatyeva nāṭaka-ṣiṣayam*³⁰

At the outset, it should be pointed out that any insignificant contemporary king cannot be featured in a Nāṭaka according to the Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa. The contemporary king should be an exceptionally endowed individual (*mahābhūta*), so that the Poet may find scope to develop his life-history into the theme of a Nāṭaka. The events of his life, selected for the treatment in a Nāṭaka, should be suitable to be invested with the *Aṛihaprakṛtis* and also to be divided into *Kāryāvasthās*, *Sandhis* etc. Sāgara seems to mean that if such an endowed contemporary king is found, the playwright is free to delineate the events of his life in a Nāṭaka. What, however, is exactly meant by the word *vartamāna* is not clear. It may indicate historical as opposed to epic and Purāṇic or simply contemporary, belonging to the age to which the poet himself belongs.

The traditional story of the composition of *Nāṭya* out of the elements of all four Vedas by Pitāmaha himself, the use of the term *itihāsa* to denote dramatic plot,³¹ and the subject matter of the first dramatic performance, i.e., the defeat of the demons at the hands of gods, as recorded in the *Nāṭya-śāstra's* ³² all tend to suggest that in its origin drama certainly utilised current old stories. But the *Nāṭya-śāstra* nowhere explicitly prohibits the lives of contemporary kings from being depicted in Nāṭaka.

It is Abhinavagupta who most emphatically opposes the above view championed by Sāgara. The great commentator of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* maintains that lives of contemporary and

historical kings should not be depicted in any form of drama (Nāṭya) not to speak of the Nāṭaka, the highest form of drama. But that there were earlier adherents of the view which was in favour of portraying the activities of contemporary kings in dramas, is borne out by the statements found in the *Abhinava-bhāratī* itself. In the first chapter of the *Nāṭya-sāstra*, Abhinava-gupta refers to a view, said to be held by some; according to which a poet may place his master by depicting the latter's life in Nāṭya. Abhinava-gupta opposes the view on the ground that some of the *rūpakas* are to deal with invented stories and some with renowned stories according to the *Nāṭya-sāstra*. So, there is no scope of *prabhucarita* in Nāṭya. Here Abhinava remarks : *naca varṇitamānacaritā-nukāro yuktah*, and adduces arguments in his favour. He maintains that the disinterestedness necessary for aesthetic response or moral edification may be hampered by the spectator's personal reactions to the proximate events of the life of a contemporary king depicted in a Nāṭaka as hero.³³ Later in the chapter XVIII of the *Nāṭya-sāstra*, Abhinava further remarks that if the life of the hero of a Nāṭaka is picked up from contemporary history, his high achievements described in the drama may fail to convince the audience and it is for this reason that Bharata speaks of *Prakhyāta* again and again.³⁴ Even a god should not be featured as a main hero in a Nāṭaka according to Abhinava who, however, maintains that divine heroines and gods as secondary characters may be introduced in Nāṭakas. A hero in a Nāṭaka says Abhinava is generally portrayed as subject to separation and pathos etc., and a god cannot be so represented without being dragged down to the level of ordinary human beings.³⁵ Thus, according to Abhinavagupta neither a contemporary king nor even a god could be featured in a Nāṭaka as hero. The hero of a Nāṭaka should always be one who is *rājarṣi-vamśaprabhava*. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* simply repeats what has been said by Abhinava-gupta in this matter in different words.³⁶ The view of the *Daśa-rūpaka* and its followers has already been discussed. Thus, with the solitary exception of Śaradātanaya all other authorities on dramaturgy beginning from Abhinava-gupta

opine against the inclusion of contemporary kings as heroes in Nāṭakas.

An enquiry into the actual practice regarding the delineation of the lives of contemporary and historical kings in dramas by ancient Indian play-wrights cannot but be interesting here. The enquiry may be started with Kālidāsa though there has been a great controversy regarding his date. Dr S.N. Dasgupta places him in the 2nd. century B. C., i. e., in the Śuṅga period.³⁷ Accepting this view it can be pointed out that the character of a contemporary and historical king has been depicted in a Nāṭaka by the Prince of Indian poets himself in his *Mālavikāgnimitra*.³⁸ On the other hand, a drama, consisting of nine Acts and with a famous theme describing the activities of historical Personages like Buddha, Śāriputra and Maudgalyāyana, has been designated *Śāriputra-prakarāṇa* by its author Aśvaghōṣa. According to *Nāṭya-śāstra*, as interpreted by Abhinavagupta, the plot of a *Prakarāṇa* may be invented or taken from *anārṣa-kāvya* like *Bṛhatkathā* etc., or similar works of other poets.³⁹ The story of the drama *Śāriputra-prakarāṇa* is neither invented nor taken from any *anārṣa* source known to us. That the story was not taken from any *ārṣa* source like the Epics and Purāṇas, that Śāriputra, the hero, was neither a king nor did belong to the family of any *rājārṣi* and that Aśvaghōṣa perhaps utilised some old *anārṣa* source for the story might have been the reasons behind calling the drama a *prakarāṇa*. It can also be surmised that Aśvaghōṣa took the events described in the drama, as contemporary even after four long centuries. It is also interesting to note that the *Svapna-Vāsavadatta* has all-along been regarded as a Nāṭaka though its story is not taken from any *ārṣa* source. Candragupta certainly did not belong to any family of royal sages, but *Mudrā-rākṣasa* is a Nāṭaka and Abhinavagupta takes it to be so.⁴⁰ Moreover, the story as depicted in the drama is not taken from any known *ārṣa* source.⁴¹ Later allegorical dramas like *Prabodha-candrodaya*, *Moharāja-parājaya* and *Sanikalpa-sūryodaya* are all styled as Nāṭaka. The drama *Moharāja-parājaya* of Yaśah-pāla, describing the conversion of Kumārapāla, the Caulukya

King of Gujrat to Jainism : may be said to have featured a contemporary king as hero. The drama, of course, written after the death of Kumārapāla. But within a few years events cannot shake off *varttamānatva* and assume *prakhyātātva*. Moreover, the drama may be supposed to have written *Prabhu-paritoṣāya*, as the author himself served under Cakravartin Abhayadeva who reigned after Kumārapāla.⁴²

From the above, it may be concluded that the school of thought to which Abhinavagupta appears to belong has not been followed by some dramatists of even later ages. On the other hand, Bhāsa, Kālidāsa and Viśākhadatta appear to have given little importance to the theory that Nāṭaka should depict the lives of those royal heroes of Epics and *Purāṇas* who led exemplary lives and that its theme should always be taken from some *arṣa* source as maintained by Abhinavagupta. But the theory itself is old enough and this can reasonably be surmised from the adherence of Aśvaghōṣa to it ; otherwise Śāriputra-prakaraṇa could not have been so designated. Among ancient theorists also, there was a powerful school of thought the adherents of which had no objection to the featuring of historical and contemporary kings as heroes in Nāṭakas, as an erudite like Abhinavagupta, as shown above, cannot be supposed to have fought against non-existent views or those advocated by negligible persons. Abhinavagupta further refers to a view as championed by Ghaṇṭaka and others which maintains that a king, whether he is renowned or not, is fit to be featured as a hero in a drama including Nāṭaka.⁴³ Sāgara also seems to maintain that it is the story that counts and that the story should satisfy all the technical exigencies of Nāṭaka as discussed above ; the hero may or may not be a *rājaraṣi-vamśa-prabhava* one. Sāgara distinctly says that the vartamāna king can be featured in a Nāṭaka, if he is an exceptionally endowed (*mahābhūta*) one.⁴⁴ A drama properly depicting the life of an exceptionally endowed historical or contemporary king can reasonably be expected to achieve its ultimate object which is moral edification through aesthetic pleasure of all sorts of spectators, as stated by the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.⁴⁵

Thus, it appears that Sāgara here simply supports an earlier view and it cannot be said that he is the earliest authority to formulate the theory, as supposed by Prof. Biswanath Bhattacharyya.⁴⁶ The *Nāṭya-śāstra* nowhere explicitly prohibits the historical and contemporary Kings from being featured in Nāṭaka. On the otherhand, it seems to have lent its implicit support to the view when it enjoins that the characters of kings and their activities, arising out of their joys and sorrows may be depicted in a Nāṭaka.⁴⁷ Māṭṛgupta also says the something in the ninth line as quoted above. So, neither Sāgara himself nor the authority or authorities he follows, can be said to have violated any principle of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* in this vital matter.

It should also be remembered in this connection that according to Indian dramaturgy, the plot of a drama is only its body⁴⁸ and it is the Rasa that infuses life in it. Without Rasa the composition fails to carry out any sense.⁴⁹ The success or otherwise of a drama depends upon whether it can or fails to evoke the Rasa (sentiment) in the minds of the spectators. It matters little whether the hero is a *rājaraṣi-vāṇsa-prabhava* one or a historical or contemporary king. This seems to be the view of catholic theorists like Sāgara and others whom he follows. Abhinavagupta's objection is based on the assumption that historical and contemporary heroes are incompetent to arouse aesthetic pleasure, the ultimate end of every literary activity. Those who favour the incorporation of historical and contemporary events in the domain of drama, certainly believe in their competency in evoking the same aesthetic pleasure, if only properly handled.

Moreover, drama is an art for the people. In its early days the people could be satisfied with the stories of legendary kings but which grew hackneyed in course of time, and there was certainly a demand for new elements. The first step adopted by the playwrights to meet this popular demand was presumably innovations in the framework of traditional stories. In due course this process brought about a complete change in the details of those stories leaving only their bare outlines with the names of heroes and heroines to survive, and this is

evident in extant dramas. For the same reason some playwrights ventured to introduce historical and contemporary stories in the field. Puritans naturally, opposed the idea and Abhinava seems to have voiced their view in his *Abhinava-bhāratī*. This tussel between the catholic and puritan groups of critics is a natural feature in the history of every literature. Indian theorists have all along sought the sanction of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* for their views and as a result serious divergences have crept in so far as the interpretation of this ancient text is concerned. Sāgara seems to have gone a step further and declares that it is not the profession of the Śāstrakāra to punish the learned who deviate a bit from the chalked-out path.⁵⁰ Śāstra is not to obstruct the progress of literature and this seems to be the view of a true critic in the modern sense of the term.

Sāgara seems to have had no objection against the portrayal of gods as heroes in Nāṭakas. He himself states that Nāṭaka is the imitation of past activities of gods etc., and in his support quotes the following verse from the *Nāṭya-śāstra* :

*devatānām manuṣyāṇām rājñām lokamahātmanām/
pūrvavṛttānucaritāṃ nāṭakam nāma tad-bhavet||*

The GOS. edition of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* reads the first half of the verse as :

devatānām ṛṣiṇām ca rājñām cotkrṣṭa-medhasām|

A manuscript reads *nāṭya* in place of *nāṭaka*. There are several other variants also.⁵¹ The reading *nāṭya* indicates that the verse refers to the contents of drama in general and not of Nāṭaka only. The word *nāṭaka* may also be used in its generic sense to mean *rūpaka*. In any case, the verse sanctions the representation of gods as main characters in dramas including Nāṭaka.

From the above discussions it follows that it is the quality of the hero that determines the suitability or otherwise of the plot to be depicted in a Nāṭaka. The *Nāṭya-śāstra* in this matter, simply states that the hero of a Nāṭaka should be renowned and exalted or magnanimous (*prakhyaṭodātta-nāyaka*).⁵² The word *udātta* is very important here. Diver-

gent views on it's interpretation have given rise to different opinions regarding the type of the hero of a Nāṭaka.

The word *udātta* has not been explained in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*. *Abhinava-bhārati* refers to the view of Śaṅkuka who is said to have maintained that the word *udātta* implies that renowned characters only are to be selected from the epics. But according to the teacher of Abhinavagupta, the word refers to the third type of renownedness as two others have been included by *prakhyātavastu*.⁵³ Abhinavagupta himself states, *udātta iti vira-rasayogya uktah*, and adds that all the four types of Dhīra-lalita, Dhīra-prasānta, Dhīroddhata and Dhīrodatta have been included by it. Thus, according to Abhinavagupta, the hero of a Nāṭaka may belong to any one of these four types.⁵⁴

Dr S. N. Shastri maintains that Sāgara seems to adhere to the school of thought according to which the hero of a Nāṭaka should belong to the Dhīra-lalita class only and goes on to prove the untenability of the view by citing instances of Nāṭakas having Dhīroddhata heroes. He also declares that Sāgara has misunderstood the real implication of Bharata's instructions contained in the following lines.⁵⁵

devā dhīroddhatā jñeyāḥ syur-dhīra-lalitā nṛpāḥ |
senāpatir-amātyaśca dhīrodāttau prakīrtitau ||
*dhīra-prasāntā vijñeyā brāhmaṇā vanijastathā ||*⁵⁶

Dr S. N. Shastri appears to have overlooked the full relevant text of the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* which distinctly says :

*sarvathā yena sarvaṃ samāpyate sa khalu nāyakaś-catuh-
 prakṛtikaḥ/dhīroddhataḥ/dhīra-lalitaḥ/dhīrodāttaḥ/dhīra-prasāntaś-
 ca*]⁵⁷

It is apparent that like Abhinavagupta, Sāgara also maintains that the hero of a Nāṭaka may belong to any one of the above four types. Following the above general instruction of the *Nāṭya-sāstra* Sāgara states that the gods are Dhīroddhatas (vehement), a king is Dhīra-lalita (gay), the general and minister are Dhīrodāttas (gallants, and a learned (*śrotriya*) Brahmin and merchant are Dhīra-prasāntas (quiet). Besides these, mixed types of heroes have also been recognised in the

Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa which adds that these types are determined by their mode of conduct in love matters.⁵⁸ The *Nāṭya-śāstra* reads the verses, quoted above, in connection with the description of *upacāra*. Sāgara is fully conscious that the above division of heroes in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* is a general instruction, mainly related to the behaviour of the heroes in their love affairs. *Nāṭya-śāstra* as it appears, here points out the most dominating quality of main characters in a drama and thus lays down some general principles regarding the delineation of characters.

That there was a school of thought of which Sāgara has wrongly been supposed to be a supporter by Dr S. N. Shastri, as stated above, has been borne out by a reference in the *Abhinava-bhārati*. It informs us that some opine that the hero of a Nāṭaka should be of a Dhīra-lalita type. And this follows from the instructions contained in *devā-dhīroddhatā* etc., of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* (quoted above), because a king only should be featured as hero in a Nāṭaka and according to the *Nāṭya-śāstra* he belongs to the Dhīra-lalita type. Abhinavagupta opposes the view and points out that Janaka, Rāma etc., depicted as heroes in Nāṭakas do not belong to Dhīra-lalita group.⁵⁹ His conclusion is that the hero of a Nāṭaka may belong to any one of those four types.⁶⁰ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* follows this interpretation of Abhinavagupta and goes a step further to declare that kings may belong to any one of the four types *rājānastu catūrvīdhāḥ*.⁶¹

Thus, there has been a controversy, among even earlier authorities, regarding the interpretation of the description of four types of heroes in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and also regarding the admissibility of those types in Nāṭakas. Sāgara clearly states that all the four types are suitable to Nāṭakas. Abhinavagupta followed by the authors of the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* admits the same in a clever way. It has been shown that there were other views also.

The *Daśa-rūpaka* seems to have bypassed the controversy. It maintains that the hero of a Nāṭaka should always be a Dhīrodatta one. In this respect, later works like

the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* and *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* follow the *Daśa-rūpaka*.⁶² If Dhanika's interpretation of the term *udātta* is accepted, then this view does not appear to be so untenable as taken by Dr S. N. Sastri.⁶³ Dhanika maintains that *audāṭyaṃ hi nāma sarvotkarsena vṛttiḥ*.⁶⁴ According to this interpretation, undoubtedly a new approach to the problem, the hero of a Nāṭaka should be described as surpassing all others around him in merits. The character of the hero in any serious drama should be the most impressive one so that the attention of the audience may easily be focused on his acting. Sanskrit drama closely observes this Principle. The *Nāṭya-śāstra* itself and authorities like Sāgara and Abhinavagupta give stress on this point in their own way, as has already been shown. The *Daśa-rūpaka*, as interpreted by Dhanika, also tries to achieve this end in an ingenious way. With the above interpretation of the term *udātta* Dhanika finds no difficulty in declaring Jīmūta-vāhana as a Dhīrodātta hero.⁶⁵ The view, however, has been severely criticised in the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa*.⁶⁶

The division of the heroes in dramas into Divya, Adivya and Divyā-divya groups is decidedly of later origin. Probably under the influence of Vaiṣṇavism⁶⁷ *Nāṭya-śāstra*, *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa* and *Abhinava-bhārati* do not make any attempt of classifying the heroes in this way.

CHAPTER II

Five Avasthās (Five successive states)

“An action when developed in full, as normally it is in the Nāṭaka, the most perfect of forms of drama, involves of necessity five stages of developments.”¹ These five stages are called five Avasthās or Kāryāvasthās of the plot, the *itivṛtta*. They are,—Ārambha (Prārambha), Prayatna, Prāptisambhava (Prāptyāśa), Niyatā-Phalapraṁpti (Niyatāpti) and Phalayoga (Phalāgama). They occur in this order as they are enumerated in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and the preceding stage naturally leads on to the succeeding one.²

Sāgara-nandin describes the five Avasthās in prose and mostly in terms of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* without quoting it word for word. But at the close of his discussion he quotes Mātṛgupta and states that Mātṛgupta describes the five Avasthās briefly in the following way.³ It can be presumed from this, that according to Sāgara, Mātṛgupta’s description of five Kāryāvasthās does not vary from that of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. Mātṛgupta’s description, as stated in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa* is :

prārambho rāvaṇa vadhe khara prabhṛti-vaiśasam |
prayatnaḥ śūrpaṇakhayā kṛtaḥ sūtāpahārataḥ ||
sugrīvasya tu sakhyena saṁjātaḥ prāpti-sambhavaḥ. |
niyatā phala-saṁprāptiḥ kumbhakarṇādi saṁkṣaye ||
yo devai rākṣasapateḥ kāryo dūṣṭamater vadhaḥ |
*phala yogaḥ sa rāmasya dharma-kāmārtha-siddhaye ||*⁴

Mātṛgupta, as it appears from the above, described five Avasthās with reference to a Nāṭaka, beginning with the forest life of Rāma and ending at the killing of Rāvaṇa. Sāgara informs us that all these are clear in the *Rāghavābhyaśrita*,⁵ an old lost Nāṭaka from which there are fourteen citations in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa*. From the above description it appears that according to Mātṛgupta each of the five successive stages is marked by an incident or incidents and the Phalayoga is marked by the last incident

bringing about the gains of the hero in the forms of virtue, pleasure and prosperity. Here Rāvaṇa-vadha has been taken to be the Phalayoga and the first stage i.e., the annihilation of Khara etc., has been shown to lead to the second stage marked by the abduction of Sīta and so on. But at the time of killing Khara etc., Rāma cannot be supposed to be conscious of the ultimate end, i.e., the killing of Rāvaṇa. So, it cannot be said that according to Mātrgupta the ultimate object of the hero is fixed in the stage of Ārambha. Moreover, in the stage of Prayatna, Mātrgupta seems to have given the scope of describing the pursuit after the desired object by some one other than the hero.

ĀRAMBHA (Beginning)

Sāgara defines Ārambha as : *bijasyaut sukyā-mātrabandhaḥ*,⁶ and illustrates the same with a verse, said to be taken from the Kośalāṅka. As a comment on the illustration he says, "This Ārambha is to accomplish this."⁷ The illustration cited describes a situation where Rāma is determined to move to the forest at his father's command and praises the move as commendable in all respects. Bija according to Sāgara, as will be shown, is the cause of the final stage of the action. Now, the exile of Rāma, the first incident, ultimately leads to the destruction of Rāvaṇa, the final stage of the action, through successive stages. But at this first stage the hero, here Rāma, cannot be said to be conscious of the ultimate goal. This is quite in conformity with the above exposition of the Ārambha by Mātrgupta. Thus, according to Sāgara Ārambha consists in the beginning of the action wherefrom a move sets afoot which ultimately leads to the final stage of the action.

It is evident that Sāgara does not make any attempt to explain the text of *Nāṭya-śāstra* quoted by himself, but through illustration brings out the implication of Ārambha

and in doing so he follows Mātrgupta, presumably with a belief that Mātrgupta does not differ from the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. The *Bhāva-prakāśa* also follows this line of thought as it appears from the illustration it cites from the *Abhijñāna-śakuntala*. According to the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* the beginning of exertion by the hero for the final aim is the Ārambha and in this respect it is followed by the *Nāṭya-candrikā*.⁹ Only anxious desire (*autsukya-mātram*) for the accomplishment of the chief aim is the Ārambha according to the *Daśa-rūpaka* and *Sāhitya-darpaṇa*.¹⁰ The *Daśa-rūpaka* is not explicit enough whether the first move or anxious desire should be always of the hero himself or not. Viśvanātha, however, maintains that this *autsukya* may be aroused in the mind of any leading character like the *nāyaka*, *nāyikā* etc.¹¹ The final object is reached through successive stages. It cannot be said that in every case, this final object is consciously desired by the character concerned at the stage of the first move. Following the view of Mātrgupta as explained before, it can be pointed out that Rāma cannot be represented as bent upon the killing of Rāvaṇa at the stage of the annihilation of Khara etc., by him.

Abhinavagupta takes *Bīja* to mean *upāya-sampat*, i.e. means and explains Ārambha as a state of deliberation and anxiety regarding the means for the attainment of the final end suitable to the hero in question. The desire giving rise to deliberation and anxiety may at this stage be rooted in the mind of the hero or his minister or heroine or hero's enemy or it may be simply an affair of *daiva* (providence).¹² Abhinavagupta seems to mean that whoever might be anxious for the means at this stage, the means should be always for the final achievement. But how it is possible in the case of a *pratīnāyaka* is not clear. The *nāṭya-darpaṇa* adds movement with anxiety for the means but follows the line of *Abhinavabhārati* closely so far as the implication of Ārambha is concerned.¹³

PRAYATNA (Effort)

Following the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, Sāgara defines Prayatna as : *Phala-yogam apatyata eva tatra vyāpāraḥ*¹⁴ ; and illustrates this second stage of the action by citing the part of a verse from the *Kulapatyaṅka* where Rāvaṇa in the guise of a hermit describes his effort, presumably directed towards the abduction of Sītā.¹⁵ Rāvaṇa certainly is not the hero of the drama from which the illustration has been cited. Thus, according to Sāgara, the zealous pursuit after the object of desire which has not yet been found, is the Prayatna. This pursuit may or may not be done by the hero himself or related directly to the final object, but must lead to the next stage of the action. This is what Mātrgupta says about Prayatna, as pointed out before.

According to Abhinavagupta, Prayatna is the more serious endeavour of any one, as in the case of Ārambha, in finding out the means for the final achievement. Here also Abhinavagupta gives stress on mental activity. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* follows Abhinava but states more explicitly that only anxiety is Ārambha but Prayatna is serious anxiety.¹⁶

The *Daśa-rūpaka*, as interpreted by Dhanika, maintains that Prayatna is the speedy activity of some one, consisting in the employment of means.¹⁷ The *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* follows the *Daśa-rūpaka* and *Avaloka*.¹⁸ Persistence of the anxiety for the attainment of the desired object is Prayatna according to the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* and this is followed by the *Nāṭaka-candrikā*.¹⁹

The *Bhāva-prakāśa* defines Prayatna after the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and illustrates it by citing the verse from the *Mālatī-mādhava* Act. I, where Kāmandakī's determined effort in uniting Mādhava with Mālatī has been described.²⁰ Thus the effort is not of the hero here.

PRĀPTI-SAMBHAVA OR PRĀPTYĀSĀ

(Prospect of success)

Sāgara defines Prāpti-sambhava briefly in the words of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* as *bhāvamātreṇa phalasya yā prāptiḥ*.²¹ The word *bhāvamātreṇa* is significant, but has not been explained by him. The *Bhāva-prakāśa* in this respect comes to our help. It gives the same definition of the Prāpti-sambhava as is found in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* but reads *sattāmātreṇa* instead of *bhāvamātreṇa*.²² The stage is illustrated by Sāgara with a citation from the *Sugrīvāṅka*, where the furious monkeys are asked to fall upon the demons. Sāgara comments on this illustration that here at the news of Sītā there is the determined effort of the monkeys to destroy the demons.²³ Here the final end (*phala*) is evidently the recovery of Sītā and this is possible only when her whereabouts are known. Hence, here there is at least a mental accomplishment of the final object of desire (*phalasya prāpti*) so far as its possibility (*bhāvamātreṇa*) is indicated and the whole effort of the hero is directed to the final achievement. Thus, *bhāvamātreṇa* in the above definition seems to mean *sattāmātreṇa* i.e., in its mere existence. So, it appears that according to Sāgara Prāpti-sambhava is the knowledge of the existence and as such, possibility of the future *phala-prāpti*. The main characteristic of this stage is thus a psychological forestalling of a chance of achieving the end, tantamount to the adoption of a plan, based on materials in hand which are regarded as conducive to success. The *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* says this in a more simple language.²⁴ The *Nāṭaka-candrikā* follows the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* and also quotes the *Nāṭya-śāstra* in its support. It also quotes the view of Dhanañjaya evidently to indicate its difference with that of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.²⁵

Abhinavagupta takes the expression *bhāvamātreṇa* to mean the removal of obstacles and the gain of additional means. Due to these two factors according to Abhinavagupta, the possibility of specific achievement but not its certainty, comes to be known at this stage. But to whom to be known is not clearly stated though this Avasthā has

been stated to be the third one of the hero.²⁶ So far as the gain of means is concerned Abhinava's view here seems to be similar to that of Mātṛgupta. Mātṛgupta, as quoted above,²⁷ seems to mean that the possibility of Rāma's success in killing Rāvaṇa is born of his friendship with Sugrīva, i.e., the gain of means. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* follows the line of Abhinavagupta.²⁸

According to the *Daśa-rūpaka* also, this third stage is one of uncertainty regarding the final accomplishment due to the existence of both suitable means and apprehension of obstacles. The *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* here quotes the *Daśa-rūpaka ad-verbum*.²⁹

It is interesting to note that all the authorities referred to above, try in their own way to suggest that in the third stage of development of the plot of a drama, the playwright suggests the final mark he wishes to hit. Here he indicates the possibility of hero's success but not its certainty.

NIYATĀ PHALAPRĀPTI NIYATĀPTI

(Certainty of attainment)

The *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa* offers two views so far as the description of the Niyatāpti is concerned. The *Nāṭya-śāstra* means that at this penultimate stage of the action, the sure success of the hero comes to be visualised as an idea (*bhāvena*).³⁰ It appears, that according to the *Nāṭya-śāstra* the playwright is to handle the plot in such a way that the audience in this stage can form an idea of the final achievement of the hero, which is yet to come and that the dramatic suspense is also maintained.

Abhinavagupta interprets the above description of the Niyatāpti in his own way. He takes the word *bhāvena* to mean by main means. According to his interpretation, at the stage of Niyatāpti it becomes apparent that the hero's final achievement is assured by main means, through the

assistance of helping means and by the removal of obstacles. *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* follows this explanation of Abhinavagupta.³¹ It may be pointed out that here also Abhinavagupta does not state specifically to whom it becomes apparent that the means are sure to bring about the *phala*.

Sāgara first explains the term Niyatāpti as : *niyatā niścītā phala-prāptir-upasthitaiveti yāvat*.³² He means to say that at this stage of Niyatāpti the final attainment is to be shown as almost come about. As an illustration he cites from the *Venī-saṃhāra* where Pāñcālaka relates the message from Vāsudeva to Yudhiṣṭhira asking the latter to make preparations for the coronation, as Bhīma is sure to kill Duryodhana in the battle already in progress.³³ The illustration shows that the success is about to come. But even after this a tragic complication is created by the unforeseen entrance of Cārvāka in this drama. So, Niyatāpti according to this explanation of Sāgara seems to consist mainly in the removal of all known obstacles.

Sāgara then gives the view of Aśmakuṭṭa which says : *arāter-apacaya-paramparā niyatā ca phala-prāpti...*³⁴ According to this view successive losses sustained by the enemy constitutes Niyatāpti. This seems to be what Mātṛgupta means by *niyatā phalasampraptiḥ kumbhakarṇādisaṃkṣaye*.³⁵ Sāgara illustrates this Niyatāpti by a citation from the Act VI of the lost Rama-play *Jānakī-rāghava* of a forgotten dramatist. Here, in the citation Lakṣmaṇa appears to console Rama that there is no cause of his dejection as the more formidable young enemies like Kumbhakarṇa, Indrajit and Kumbha have already been killed and there remains only the old Rāvaṇa.³⁶ The illustration refers to the number of losses of Rāvaṇa, the enemy of the hero (Rāma) of the drama and this is the characteristic feature of Niyatāpti according to Mātṛgupta and Aśmakuṭṭa as recorded by Sāgara.

The *Daśa-rūpaka* holds that Niyatāpti is the certainty of final achievement of the hero due to the want of obstacles.³⁷ The *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* simply quotes this statement of the *Daśa-rūpaka* and the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* also means the same

and is followed by the *Nāṭaka-Candrikā*³⁸ This view seems to be somewhat similar to that of Abhinavagupta but not so expressive and clear.

PHALAYOGA

(Accomplishment, Consummation)

Phalagama or Phalayoga is the last stage of the action consisting mainly of the accomplishment of the desired object of the hero. Following the *Nāṭya-śāstra* Sāgara describes phalayoga as :

*abhipretam-anurūpaṃ kriyā-phalaṃ yatra niṣpannam sa phalayogaḥ.*³⁹

The illustration is cited from the *Jānakī-rāghava*. In the Act I of the drama, as quoted and commented upon by Sāgara, the killing of Rāvaṇa and the rescue of Sītā have been referred to through the dialogues of Sītā and Priyaṃvadā. In the last Act, says Sāgara, both have been accomplished in accordance with what was referred to before and as such, both are to be considered as Phalayoga.⁴⁰ By *anurūpa* he seems to mean in accordance to what has been hinted at before. It may be noted here that Mātṛgupta also as quoted above, says that the killing of Rāvaṇa by Rāma is Phalayoga. It appears then that according to Mātṛgupta whom Sāgara seems to have followed, Phalayoga is also marked by incident or incidents. Sāgara thus seems to maintain that here in the last stage the desired fruits of action (*abhipretam kriyāphalam*) should be represented as attained (*niṣpannam*) and this should occur in such a way as to conform with the beginning.

According to Abhinavagupta, that state of the hero (*sāvastā nāyakasya*) is *phalayoga* in which he achieves in full the suitable object desired by him. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* also says the same in different words.⁴¹ The *Daśa-rūpaka* simply states that the *phalayoga* consists in the full and final attainment of the hero. The *Sāhitya-darpaṇa*, *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* and *Nāṭaka-candrikā* just follow the *Daśa-rūpaka*.⁴²

In this last stage of the action of a drama the playwright unfolds the meaning of the beginning and successive stage. In every serious Sanskrit drama worthy of its name, the dramatist conveys a noble idea and tries to set an ideal. This idea acts like a guiding force throughout the play. The incidents are represented to occur as connected by a chain ;—the central idea. In the Phalayoga this idea finally unfolds its nature and establishes the ideal firmly. Thus, from another point of view, the Phalayoga consists in the achievement of the dramatist's own desired object.

There has been a great confusion regarding the exact implication of the five Avasthās and the fact has been recorded by Śāradātanaya who maintains that the Phala, so far as the construction of the plot of drama is concerned, "Is connected with the desired end either of the poet or of the hero of the play concerned."⁴³ It may be said that the Avasthās are connected with the hero and other dramatic personages objectively, but subjectly they are the concern of the poet and that the *Nāṭya-śāstra* itself and Abhinavaguptabhāratī appear to have supported this view.⁴⁴

Dr. V. M. Kulkarni after a study of the Avasthās, mainly in the line of *Abhinava-bhāratī*, arrives at the conclusion that this division of the plot of a drama is a subjective analysis of the theme inasmuch as, "The Avasthās are primarily the mental states or attitudes of the hero with reference to the end aimed at by him."⁴⁵ But from our above analysis it appears that no stage can strictly be called as a mental state of the hero. It has been clearly shown that at least the first two stages may not refer necessarily to the mental attitudes of the hero according to Abhinavagupta and that no stage has been explained as mental state of the hero by Māṛḡgupta and Śāgara and also that according to the later theorists the question of the final end aimed at by the hero may not arise at all in the first two stages. Other authorities also hold almost the same opinion in the matter, as has been discussed in details. The analysis is subjective no doubt,

but that is from the standpoint of the playwright, as pointed out above. Abhinavagupta, of course, gives in some cases stress on mental states in explaining the Avasthās but not always of the hero himself. Abhinavagupta's analysis of the Avasthās seems to be one from the standpoint of the dramatist materialised through the characters of the play concerned.

Sāgara following Māṭṛgupta mainly, analyses the plot purely from the standpoint of a spectator and his process may be called an objective one. He seems to have given stress on the fact that the Avasthās are successive stages in the development of the action and each Avasthā is marked by an incident or incidents. It has also been shown where he differs from other theorists and mainly from Abhinavagupta. Among other writers, the authors of the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* follow closely the line of Abhinavagupta, and Śāradātanaya in some places seems to adhere to the school of thought represented by Sāgara as has been pointed out in respective occasions.

All the theorists, however, are of opinion that from the very beginning of the action the situations in a drama, should be depicted in such a way that in each case the preceding stage should naturally lead on to the succeeding one and ultimately the whole action should culminate to one point. This leads us to conclude that the idea of a mono-centric plot was firmly established in the realm of Indian dramaturgy.

CHAPTER III

ARTHAPRAKṚTI

(Constituent Elements of the Plot)

The analysis of the plot into five Arthaprakṛtis depend upon the formal division of the plot of a drama into principal and secondary actions, known in Indian dramaturgy as Ādhikārika and Prāsaṅgika Vṛttas. The *itivyṛtta* or the plot of a drama consists of situations some of which are directly connected with the main thread of the story and some indirectly. From this point of view the plot has been analysed as consisting of two Parts: Ādhikārika and Prasaṅgika or Ānuṣaṅgika.¹ The plot of a drama is an organic whole and the so-called parts are inseparably connected behaving like elements in the constitution of a living organism. When they are artificially thought to be separated, they lose their dramatic quality. Moreover, the complex structure of a drama does not to easily yield to the above sort of formal division. But the profession of a critic is sometimes like that of a student of surgery. For the sake of the analysis of the plot such a division is essential.

Ādhikārika-vṛtta or the principal action plays the leading part in the final attainment and is directly connected with the hero. The Prāsaṅgika one (incidental or secondary action) on the other hand, is not directly related to the final achievement but is contributory to it.² The point has been made clear by an illustration in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*. It says that in a plot where the killing of Rāvaṇa is the Karya (Principal action), the slaying of Valin by Rāma to win Sugrīva's alliance is Ānuṣaṅgika.³

Sāgara informs us that according to some, the Ānuṣaṅgika is a contributory story within the main story.⁴ Evidently, this is not the opinion of Sāgara. The secondary action is undoubtedly contributory to the principal action, but it may not always be a full-fledged story (*kathā*). It may be a mere incident.

There has been a long-standing controversy regarding the significance of the term Arthaprakṛti. According to Abhinavagupta the five Arthaprakṛtis are but means for the attainment of the fruit, i.e., the final end.⁵ This is also the opinion of Dhanika, and Viśvanātha simply repeats the statement of Dhanika. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* also maintains the same opinion.⁶

Rasārṇava-sudhākara takes the Arthaprakṛtis to mean parts of the story. The view is not a new one. Abhinavagupta rightly criticises the view on the ground that if Arthaprakṛtis are taken to be the parts of the whole story, then the Sandhis also should be regarded as Arthaprakṛtis, which they are not.⁷

The standpoint of the *Bhāva-prakāśa* is a bit difficult to ascertain due to the nature of the text. It reads : *arthaprakṛtayah pañca kathā-bhedasya* (one manuscript reads *tathā dehasya*) *hetavaḥ* etc *kathāśarīrasya hetavaḥ parikīrtitāḥ*.⁸ The reading *dehasya* seems to be probable as the two statements become identical. According to Śāradātanaya then Arthaprakṛtis are elements of the plot. They are the causes of the plot inasmuch as they combine to produce the plot. This definition of the Bhā. pra. is evidently taken from the *Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa* of Bhojarāja who also looks upon the Arthaprakṛtis as elements of the plot.⁹

Leaving aside the standpoint of the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* we get two views regarding the nature of the Arthaprakṛtis. According to Abhinavagupta and others, as shown before, they are, *phala-hetavaḥ* or *prayojana-siddhi-hetavaḥ*, and according to Bhoja and Śāradātanaya they are, *kathāśarīra-hetavaḥ*. It is interesting to note that both these schools of thought accept the word *prakṛti* to mean *hetu* (cause), but according to the former *artha* means *phala* while according to the latter it denotes the *kathāśarīra*, the story.

Sāgarāya says : *nāṭakīyavastunaḥ...pañca prakṛtayah svabhāvāḥ bhavanti*.¹⁰ It is evident that the word *artha* here, has been taken to mean the plot of a drama, but only a synonym of the word *Prakṛti* is given. The word *prakṛti*

or *svabhāva* here may however, be taken to mean constituent elements or inherent properties as other meanings of these two words appear unsuitable in this context. It thus appears that according to Sāgara Arthaprakṛtis are constituent elements of the plot. This interpretation is also supported by his own statement that without these there can be no plot of a Nāṭaka.¹¹ Bhojarāja and Śāradātanaya as discussed above, appear to have shared the view held by Sāgara. It may also be pointed out here that Rūpa-gosvāmin, an ardent follower of the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara*, describes Arthaprakṛti as : *pañca-vidhyāt kathāyāstu prakṛtiḥ pañcadhā smṛtā*.¹² It is, however, not clear that the word *prakṛti* means here, but from the statement it appears that the Vaiṣṇava savant believed in the five-fold division of the plot. The whole statement may mean that as the plot has not got fivefold division so their causes or elements are also five. In any case, it is a confusing description, having its origin, perhaps, to the influence of the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* and the school of thought represented by the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*.

It may further be pointed out that the view held by Sāgara and Bhoja regarding the Arthaprakṛtis, appear to be an older one. Abhinavagupta refers to it. While commenting on *itivṛtte yathāvasthāḥ*¹³...of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* he says : *artha itivṛtte prakṛtaya iti vaktavye arthagrahaṇam atirīkṣam syāt ityavasthābhīṣca tulyatāvarṇanam varṇanāmātram syādīti kīmanena*.¹⁴ The above verse of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* enjoins that as there are five Avasthās in the *itivṛtta*, so there are five Arthaprakṛtis. Abhinava-gupta seems to mean that *artha* in the word *arthaprakṛtayaḥ* of the verse, becomes superfluous if it is taken in the sense of *itivṛtta* which follows from the first half of the verse. Moreover, in that case Arthaprakṛtis become equated with the Avasthās, as both of these groups signify nothing more than the nature of the plot, analysed in its different stages of development and as such, the description of the Arthaprakṛtis becomes useless. So far as the above verse of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* is concerned, the cogency of the first argument of Abhinavagupta is unquestionable. But the editor

informs us that the first half of the verse is not found in most of the manuscripts¹⁵ and Sāgara also has not included the verse in his text. The second argument cannot be directed against Sāgara inasmuch as according to his standpoint Avasthās are five stages in the development of the action and the Arthaprakṛtis are but constituent elements and not divisions of the plot and as such, the two pentads cannot be equated.

Regarding the order of the Arthaprakṛtis in a drama, Sāgara maintains silence. The problem will be considered in details in due course.¹⁶

To sum up, Arthaprakṛtis have been taken at least in three different senses by different schools of thought. According to the *Abhinava-bhāratī Daśarūpaka*, *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* and *Sāhitya-darpaṇa*, they are the means for the final attainment (*phalāhetavaḥ*). Sāgara maintains that they are constituent elements of the plot and this view seems to be shared by Bhojadeva and Śāradātanaya. The *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* takes them as parts of the plot.

BIJA (Germ)

Bīja is the first of the Arthaprakṛtis and as the very seeds of the dramatic action it comes first. Bīja according to Sāgara is :

*nāṭakārthasya phalabhūtasya karaṇam.*¹

It has been shown that Arthaprakṛtis according to Sāgara are constituent elements of the plot and *artha* in this context has been taken to mean the plot itself, the action as a whole with phalayoga as its final stage. Thus, Bīja according to the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* is that constituent element of the theme which causes the action culminating into fruition. Simply speaking, it is the cause of the final stage of the action. It has also been shown that according to Mātṛgupta and Sāgara each stage (Avasthā) is marked by an event or events. Germ of the final event is sown in the initial stage of the action. The action practically begins with the sowing of the germ which

sprouts and develops with the progress of successive stages culminating into fruition, i.e., the final event, and as such, it is said to be pervading over the entire play.

Sāgara in support of his view quotes the description of the Bīja from the *Nāṭya-śāstra* which says that the Bīja is indicated or sown (in the initial stage) slightly but spreads out in various ways and ends in fruition.² We have shown that there are three different views held by different schools of thought regarding the nature of the Arthaprakṛti. Bīja being an Arthaprakṛti, has also been taken in three different senses, viz., *phalaketu*, *nāṭakiyavastu-svabhāva* and *kathābhāga*. But that it causes the action to culminate into fruition, is the opinion of all.³ There are, however, subtle differences of opinions regarding the exact implication of fruition and this will be shown later.

The *Nāṭya-śāstra* says, as shown above, that the Bīja is to be indicated or sown slightly (at the initial stage). By slightly (*kiñcit stotam*) Sāgara means by such ways as *śleṣa*, *chāyā* and *upakṣepa*.⁴ *Śleṣa*, says Sāgara, is *dvyarthavacana*, i.e., conveying of double meanings, *chāyā* is similarity of incidents (*kathāśāmyam*) and *upakṣepa* means introduction of the plot (*arthopasthāpanam*).⁵

While discussing the Mukha-sandhi, Sāgara quotes a verse with similar import as above and attributes the same to Āchārya. The text runs :.....*ācārya aha |*

yasminnākhyāna bījasya śleṣeṇa cchāyayāpi vā |

*kriyate kīrtanam sadbhis-tan mukham parikīrtitam |*⁶

Of the three ways of sowing the Bīja, as mentioned by Sāgara above, two are included here in this verse; the Upakṣepa is omitted. By the epithet *ācārya* Sāgara refers to Bharata invariably. It may be presumed that according to the belief of Sāgara the above verse belongs to the work of Bharata. But no trace of it is found in the present *Nāṭya-śāstra*. It is interesting to point out here that Tārānātha Tarkavācaspati in his commentary on the verse. "satpakṣa madhuragirah..." of the Veṇī-saṁhāra quotes : *śleṣacchāyopadeśaiśca samuddiṣṭam visarpati | Yat phalodaya-*

paryantam tad bijam iha kīrtitam"/. The said pandita then remarks: *iti bharatokta-phalodaya-paryantam prabandhapratipādyam artham bijarūpeṇa śleṣeṇa varṇayati*".⁷ *upadeśaiḥ* in the first *pada* of the verse quoted by Tārānātha Tarkavācaspati, may be replaced by *upakṣepaiḥ* on the evidence of the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*. Sāgara also illustrates the indication of the Bīja through *śleṣa* with the same verse from the *Veṇi-saṃhāra* as above, where the *Sūtra-dhāra* describes Autumn but the hidden meaning of which is the total destruction of the Kauravas.⁸ The verse, quoted and attributed to Bharata by Tārānātha Tarkavācaspati also is not found in the present *Nāṭya-śāstra*. Of the above two verses, attributed to Bharata, the one found in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* describes the Mukha sandhi and the other, quoted by Tārānātha Tarkavācaspati describes the Bīja. The former one mentions two ways of indicating the Bīja while the latter points out three ways. Sāgara himself also maintains that Bīja can be indicated in the same three ways. The different ways of indicating the Bīja, referred to in the above two verses, have not been mentioned by any other known authority like Abhinavagupta, Dhanañjaya, Rāmacandra, āradātanaya, Viśvanātha etc... But both the verses have been attributed to Bharata. The only conclusion that can be derived from all these is that there were other versions of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* which have not come down to us. The view contained in the above two verses might have been current in the eastern part of India, probably in Bengal, the homeland of Tārānātha Tarkavācaspati where it was extant even before a century, otherwise we could have found it in the work of any other authority, mentioned above. Tārānātha might have collected the verse from some other commentary or from any other second-hand source. But Sāgara certainly utilised a copy of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* which did not differ materially from its present version. It seems probable that Sāgara, also hailed from eastern India and that there was an eastern version of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.⁹ Of course, a single instance cannot decide the issue.

Sāgara illustrates the indication of Bīja through similarity

of incidents (śleṣa) with a verse from the *Jānaki-rāghava*. The verse concerned, seems to be the opening one of the drama¹⁰ and describes how Viṣṇu rescued his beloved Earth from the nether region by killing the demon who confined her there.¹¹ Here a hint is given of the future events of killing of Rāvaṇa by Rāma and the rescue of Sītā constituting, evidently, the Phalayoga of the drama.

As an illustration of the indication of the Bīja through Upakṣepa, the last verse of the Prastāvanā from the Kundamālā has been quoted. Here the Sūtradhāra introduces directly the play with such words as, here Lakṣmaṇa is taking Sītā to the forest.¹² It should be noted that in each of the above three cases the hint to the final object (*phala*) has been taken to be the indication of Bīja. Practically speaking, Bīja does not differ materially from the Phala; the former is the unmanifested state and the latter is the fully manifested state of the same element. Abhinavagupta rightly says that the fruit also may be said to be the germ : *phalam apica bhaviṣyadupāyāvinābhāvad bījam ityucyate*.¹³ It also appears that Sāgara supports the indication of Bīja in the Prastāvanā.

Sāgara offers another view according to which Bīja is the means of achieving the desired end and in five successive Sandhis it should be shown as sown, sprouted, developed, sought for and yielding fruit.¹⁴ This evidently is the opinion of one of those theorists who take Arthaprakṛti as *phala-hetu*. The metaphor of the growth and development of a tree from the seed, as [used here, has also been utilised in the *Bhāva-prakāśana* and *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* to explain the progress of the action from its initial stage to the conclusion.¹⁵

How to begin a drama is really a problem to the playwright. The genesis of action, called *bījanyāsa* in Sanskrit dramaturgy, should be appealing and capable of leading the whole action to the desired end of the playwright, and this must appear as its logical consequence. Much of the success of a drama depends upon the beginning. The Bīja should be so introduced that it appears in the circumstances natural

and appropriate. The Indian theorists took up the matter seriously and consequently we come across different suggestions regarding this important topic.

Mātr̥gupta, as quoted by Raghava-bhaṭṭa treats the introduction of Bīja more elaborately and from different angles.¹⁶ According to Mātr̥gupta the Bīja may be introduced in different manners. The playwright may begin his drama with a hint to the cause of the fruit only, or the fruit itself. The play may also be started with the beginning of the endeavour for the attainment of the final end. The poet may first introduce both the fruit and activity for its attainment or simply the activity, particularly mentioned. Mātr̥gupta further maintains that *Phalabīja* is that which ends in fruition, the story (*kathā*) is the *Vastubīja* and the hero is the *Arthabīja*. This *Plala-bīja* of Mātr̥gupta is the Bīja of the *Nāṭya-sāstra* as explained above. But what is exactly meant either by the *Vastu-bīja* or *Artha-bīja* is not clear. *Vastu* and *Artha* are generally used as synonyms in the texts of dramaturgy to mean *stīrṭta*, the theme of the drama. Moreover, *Kathā* is said to be the *Vastubīja*, while *Kathā* and *Vastu* also denote the samething. A subtle difference between *Kathā* and *Vastu* may, however, be surmised ; *Kathā* may be taken to mean simply the story and *Vastu* to mean the plot of the drama. The story is the source (*bīja*) of the plot in the sense that the latter is shaped out of the former. *Artha* may also mean the *Prayojana* and the hero is the *Artha-bīja* in the sense that his *Prayojana* is represented as served in a drama. Now, in every *Nāṭaka* these three germs are certainly present. The only significance that can be surmised in designating the above three as Bīja is the fact that according to the nature of the plot any one of them may get prominence over the others and the action may be started with any one of the three types of Bīja. There may be *Nāṭaka* where either the course of the action or the conclusions is not definitely known to the audience. In such a case the story itself becomes more attractive. The *Kundamālā* and the *Uttara-rāma-carita* are the best examples of this type of *Nāṭaka*. In both the dramas the plot, though related to the *Rāmāyaṇa*, is practically new

in the sence that neither the conclusion nor the course of the action is borrowed from the source and known to the audience. In such a case the theme (*vastu*) itself receives better attention from the spectators and we know that the above two Nāṭakas start with a critical situation of the main story, borrowed from the source. On the other hand, in a Nāṭaka like *Veṇī-saṃhāra*, where there is no such striking innovation in the plot or deviation from the known conclusion of source, the hero becomes the main centre of attraction and the poet takes special care in his characterisation. Such a Nāṭaka may be started with the introduction of the hero on the stage. Bhīma in the *Veṇī-saṃhāra* captures the audience at the very starting of the play.¹⁷ The drama *Abhijñāna-śakuntala* begins with the Artha-bīja, i.e., with the entrance of the king as chasing a deer, but very soon the poet creates opportunity of sowing the Phala-bīja in the form of a benediction showered on the king by the ascetics.¹⁸ The drama *Ratnāvalī*, practically begins with the Phala-bīja. After the exit of the Sūtradhāra, the minister Yaugandharāyaṇa enters and almost expresses the ultimate end to be achieved by the king.

The above three Bījas, as described by Mātṛgupta must be there in every drama but any one of them may get prominence due to the nature of the plot, as shown above. Mātṛgupta's above observation thus seems to be based on a close study of the actual practice.¹⁹ Abhinavagupta also maintains that in different dramas Bīja may be of different forms. The sowing of the Bīja may be done by indicating the means or the Phala or both, and the Phala may be of different varieties. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* reiterates what has been said in the *Abhinava-bhārati*.²⁰

Bindu (Sign of Continuity)

Sāgara quotes the definition of Bindu from the *Nāṭya-śāstra*¹ and according to his interpretation Bindu is the cause of the continuity of the action upto the end when its main purpose (*pradhāna prayojana*) is interrupted by some subsidiary

issues.⁷ He illustrates Bindu with the verse “*lākṣāgrhānala...*”, from the *Venī-saṃhāra* and comments that in the verse the succession of wrongs done by Duryodhana has been referred to and thus the continuity of action is maintained by showing the continuity of purpose, i.e., the destruction of the Kauravas.⁸ Neither the illustration nor Sāgara’s comment on it is expressive enough to give an idea of the Bindu. The illustration is practically the opening verse of the *Venī-saṃhāra* and as such, the interruption of the main purpose by subsidiary issues giving scope for the Bindu does not arise here at all. Śāradātanaya informs us that according to Kohalā when the main purpose (*phala*) of the Bīja is disconnected by subsidiary purposes, Bindu is the cause of its continuation.⁴ This is also what Sāgara means. Śāradātanaya again says: *lākṣāgrhānaleyādi bindoḥ sāmānyalakṣaṇam*.⁵ Śāradātanaya here seems to be influenced by Sāgara and offers a clue to the exposition of the latter’s view on Bindu. The verse *lākṣāgrhānala...*, indicates the main purpose of the drama and continuity of this purpose acts as a connecting link where there is a break in the main motif. So, this verse has been taken to be a *sāmānyalakṣaṇa* of the Bindu. Like the Bīja the Bindu in this sense also continues throughout the play.

Sāgara records two other views on Bindu, according to the first of which it is the basic factor of the theme of a drama which is voiced in every act with indignation and firmness till the end of the action.⁶ The view is really significant, continuity is shown here “in the form of pivotal idea, recurring in each Act.”⁷ The pulling of Draupadī’s hair has been voiced in every Act of the *Venī-saṃhāra* with indignation, and the resolution of self-sacrifice by Jīmūtavāhana has been mentioned with firmness in the *Nāgānanda*. These are two well-known instances of the reference to the main urge behind the action, in every Act. Besides these two Sāgara cites two other illustrations, one from the *Rāghavābhyaśaya* and other from the *Jānakīrāghava*.⁸ Śāradātanaya holds also a similar view and states that Bindu may be due to *māna* or *vipatti* the former is expressed through anger and the latter through grief.⁹

Another view on Bindu has been discussed in the form of an illustration by Sīgara. It is said that the representation of successive slaughter of Mārīca, Khara with his hosts. Kumbhakarna and Indrajit is the Bindu in a theme depicting the killing of Rāvaṇa. Similarly, the killing of Droṇa etc., is so in a play describing the destruction of the Kauravas.¹⁰ But the description of successive losses sustained by the enemy has been shown by Sāgara to be the characteristic of Niyatāpti according to Aśmakutṭa and this has been discussed before. The view seems to imply that it is only in the stage of Niyatāpti Bindu is the cause of continuity (*acch edakāraṇa*). Before this stage the certainty of the final achievement cannot be disclosed for the sake of dramatic suspense. In Niyatāpti a clear idea of the final achievement of the hero can be formed by the audience and as such a real connection is established between the past stages and the future Phalāgama. This view has not been referred to by any other authority and cannot be deduced from the text of Bharata. Moreover, Bindu as a connecting element may be required to be employed in any stage of the action of a drama.

Abhinavagupta seems to maintain that Bindu is the hero's knowledge of the connecting link when in course of the action the employment of means for the attainment of the desired object becomes disconnected by something else.¹¹ Arthaprakṛtis are means according to Abhinavagupta and this knowledge of the connecting link also acts as means so far as the progress of the action is concerned. According to this view the constant employment of means for the final attainment, i.e., the gradual progress towards the final end, constitutes the main thread of the action. This progress may be side-tracked due to the subsidiary elements of the story. In such cases the playwright revives the main current of the story tactfully by representing the character aiming at the final achievement, as being conscious about the employment of means. Abhinavagupta further seems to mean that under different circumstances in different dramas, the hero himself or his associates or both may be represented as searching after the means for the final achievements and as such, the revival of the main current of

the theme (Bindu) may also be represented as due to the effort of the hero or his associates or both. It is also clearly stated by Abhinavagupta that both Bīja and Bindu continue throughout the action and the difference between the two is that the scope of the latter originates after that of the former.¹² From the above discussion it appears that there is no two opinions, so far as the basic function of the Bindu is concerned. Sāgara offers three views regarding the nature of the Bindu and the last two are referred to as those maintained by others. The first view, evidently his own, follows the line of Kohala, as presented by Śāradātanaya. This one is the generally accepted view on Bindu.¹³ The second one is really significant, inasmuch as it shows that a single idea maintains the continuity throughout the action of a drama.¹⁴ Both the views have been recorded by Śāradātanaya without any line of demarcation drawn between the two. The third view, referred to by Sāgara, has been shown to be an obsolete one. Abhinavagupta elaborates the matter and shows how Bindu, as a means originates and maintains the continuity of the action. He in so many words practically says the something as said by Kohala and partially supports the second view offered in the Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa. In another place Abhinavagupta states that Bindu as the speech at the end of each Aṅka connects the preceding Aṅka with the succeeding one. The Nāṭya-darpaṇa and Daśa-rūpaka also maintain the same view.¹⁵ It is interesting to note that Kātyavema in his commentary points out Bindu at the close of each Aṅka of the Mālavikāgnimitra.¹⁶ The view occurs in the discussion of Aṅka in both Abhinava-bhāratī and Nāṭya-darpaṇa. The close of an Aṅka may be taken to be an occasion of the Bindu but certainly not the only one, and the above two works also do not mean so. Bindu may occur whenever there is a break in the main current of the story and at the close of an Aṅka it is to provide for a fresh impetus to the movement of the play.

The word Bindu, meaning a drop has been taken up in different works to elaborate the idea with the help of similes. Sāgara says that as drops of water dripping from the sides of

a thatch indicate the fall of water even when the rain is over, so, Bindu also indicates the purpose and maintains the continuity of the main action when it is interrupted by secondary issues.¹⁷ Abhinavagupta maintains that Bindu is like a drop of oil and the simile has been elaborated by Dhanika when he says that as a drop of oil spreads over the surface of water, Bindu also is a wide-spreading element.¹⁸ Ricipati quotes a verse with similar meaning and attributes the same to Bharata.¹⁹ The verse, however, is not found in the present *Nāṭya-śāstra*. The *Rasārnava-sudhākara* draws a very interesting simile on Bindu. It says that as drops of water being sprinkled to the root of the tree produce fruit, so also the Bindu is indicated again and again.²⁰ This simile suits better with the view that holds Bindu as a pivotal idea recurring in each Act.

Patākā (Episode)

It has been pointed out before that the plot of a drama is generally analysed in Indian dramaturgy as consisting of two Parts,—the Ādhikārika and the Prāsaṅgika, i.e., the principal and the secondary action. This secondary action or the subsidiary portion of the plot (*prāsaṅgika-vṛtta*) is of two kinds,—the Patākā and Prakarī. The main difference between the two is that the duration of the former is longer than that of the latter.¹

The naming of the subsidiary portion of the action of longer duration as Patākā seems to have given rise to several conjectures regarding its exact significance. Sāgara says that as a banner on a pole placed in a certain place indicates the whole army, so also the Patākā occupying a certain portion of the action exposes the entire play (*nāṭyakuṭhadesa-vartinī nāṭakam sakalam eva prakāśayati*). Abhinavagupta says that the episode (Patākā) is called a Patākā by tradition as it is useful.² Dhanika maintains that as the banner is the symbol of the king so also the Patākā bears the special marks of the hero, so far as it

helps him. Similar also seems to be the view of the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara*. The subtle differences of views regarding the nature of *Patākā* among above authorities are thus brought home to us. According to *Sāgara*, *Arthaprakṛtis* are elements of the plot and as such *Patākā* being an element helps the delineation of the entire plot through its assistance to the main plot. According to *Abhinavagupta* *Patākā*, being a means, as all *Arthaprakṛtis* are, is useful to the hero. *Dhanika* and *Śiṅgabhūpāla* state this more explicitly.

Sāgara quotes the definition of the *Patākā* directly from the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and adds a gloss on the same. He maintains that the existence of the *Patākā* is for the sake of another as it contributes to lead the main action to its goal. The *Patākā* (*vṛtta*) itself also assumes the character of the main action for the display of heroic quality. As an illustration of *Patākā-nāyaka* *Sāgara* cites the character of *Karṇa* in the *Veṇīsaṃhāra* and comment that though this character has been introduced to help *Duryodhana*, yet itself displays its own valour and has been endowed with the qualities of a hero by the poet.⁵ It appears from the above that according to *Sāgara* *Patākā* may be the helper of even the *Pratināyaka*, i.e., the enemy of the *Pradhānāyaka*.

Sāgara further says that *Patākā* according to some, is the action of the *Upanāyaka* and that it is *sthūlārtha*. According to this view, adds *Sāgara*, what is done by the *Upanāyaka* (secondary hero) coming forward (*prādhānyam avalambya*) to help the main hero, constitutes *Patākā*; as the activities of *Makaranda* in the *Mālutimādhava* comes to the help of *Mādhava*.⁷

The *Bhāva-prakāśaṇa* and the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* explicitly state that the *upanāyaka-vṛttānta* is the *Patākā*. *Sārada-tanaya* maintains that the *Patākā-nāyaka* is almost equal to the main hero (*tatsamāna*).⁸ *Abhinavagupta* cites the characters of *Sugrīva* and *Vibhīṣaṇa*, as *Patākā-nāyakas*, *Dhanika* maintains that characters like *Sugrīva* etc., which help the hero are *Patākās*.⁹ *Viśvanātha* also holds the view

that the Patākā-nāyaka should always be an ally of the main hero.¹⁰ It is evident then that Sāgara's view that an ally of the Pratināyaka also may be taken to be the leader of the Patākā is opposed to the views of almost all the reputed authorities on dramaturgy. It is easy to understand the position of Abhinavagupta and others who take the Arthaprakṛtis as means for the final achievement of the hero (*prayojana-siddhi-hetavaḥ* or *phala-hetavaḥ*). Either by the Pratināyaka or by his ally no *prayojana-siddhi* of the main hero is possible if not in an indirect way. The *Nāṭya-śāstra* says that the Patākā is *pradhānasyopakāraka* and *pradhānavat*. Abhinavagupta and others take the word *pradhāna* to mean the main hero, while Sāgara seems to have taken the word as referring to the main plot itself. In a drama where the main theme is related to a struggle between the hero and his enemy (*nāyaka* and *pratināyaka*), both of them should be considered as *pradhānas*. Both the characters are equally important as the main plot rests on both. In such a drama an ally of the either may be called a Patākā-nāyaka if only he satisfies other conditions. In dramas, where there are no such struggle the ally of the hero may occupy the position of a Patākā-nāyaka if otherwise suitable. This seems to be the view of Sāgara. The drama *Venī-saṃhāra* describes the struggle between Bhīma and Duryodhana mainly. Karṇa an ally of the latter whose *virtu* bears the marks of the *pradhāna*, may rightly be called a Patākā-nāyaka from the above point of view. The view that the *upanāyaka-carita* is the Patākā is *sthūlārtha-varṇana* according to Sāgara. Here he seems to mean that generally the Upanāyaka, who is an ally of the hero, is considered to be a Patākā-nāyaka but not everywhere. The *virtu* of the Pratināyaka himself in dramas like the *Venī-saṃhāra* cannot be called a Patākā as he also aspires for the achievement and his struggle against the main hero constitutes the main plot, in short his *virtu* according to Sāgara is also *pradhāna*.

Regarding the problem whether a Patākā-nāyaka may be depicted as gaining some end or not, Sāgara maintains

a silence. But he states clearly that the Prakarī should be of shorter duration and always serving the interests of others and never of its own. Sāgara does not prohibit the delineation of some incidental gain to the Patākā-nāyaka where it is possible. He puts more stress on the merits of the Patākā-nāyaka than on his gain. The ally of a Prati-nāyaka cannot be described as gaining some end in a drama, as the defeat of the Prati-nāyaka himself in any Sanskrit drama a settled fact. There is, however, no difficulty in showing the gains of a helper of the main hero who is sure to win.

Abhinavagupta maintains that Patākā as an Arthaprakṛti is a means and as such, serves other's interests. But, the hero of the Patākā-ṛtta may be described as serving his own interests too.¹¹ This is evident in the character of Vibhīṣaṇa, Makaranda etc. The *Bhāva-prakāśaṇa*, *Nāṭya-darpaṇa*, *Rasārnava-sudhākara* and the *Nāṭika-candrikā* hold that the Patākā-nāyaka also achieves his own object of desire.¹² The *Dāsa-rupaka* does not specifically say anything regarding the problem. But, from its definition of the Prāsaṅgika-ṛtta it appears that both Patākā and Prakarī may be delineated as having incidental gains.¹³ Viśvanātha appears to be apparently self-contradictory when in the same breath he enjoins :

patākā-nāyakasya syān-na svakīya-phalāntaram |

garbhe-sandhau vimarṣe vā nirvāhas-tasya jāyate || and

yathā sugrivāheḥ rājya-prāpti-yādi |¹⁴ Different suggestions to mitigate the difficulty in finding out the exact significance of the above extract, have been offered both by classical and modern critics. The suggestion that the portion of the Patākā-ṛtta which deals with the personal achievement of the Patākā-nāyaka should not be treated as Patākā proper,¹⁵ is untenable, at least Viśvanātha seems to have given no such indication. The second half of the verse and the illustration, taken together, may mean that the *svārtha-lābha* of the Patākā-nāyaka is to be depicted within the *Vimarṣa-sandhi*. But the first half of the verse explicitly denies any separate Phala of the Patākā. What

exactly Viśvanātha means here is not clear. The whole may be taken to mean that the Patākā-nāyaka should not have any separate Phala (*svakīya phalāntara*) whatever the Patākā-nāyaka gains is but incidental and ultimately comes to the help of the hero. The *rājyalābha* of Sugrīva, is not a separate Phala-lābha but a means through which the hero himself gets an ally. This mitra-lābha of the hero is to be shown latest in the Vimarśa-sandhi.

Regarding the extent of Patākā's duration in a drama the *Nāṭya-śāstra* says : *agarbhad avimarśād va patākā vini-vartate*.¹⁶ According to Abhinavagupta the verse enjoins that the achievement of the desired object of the Patākā-nāyaka is to be depicted either in the Pratimukha or in the Garbha Sandhi. After that, says Abhinavagupta, the Patākā-nāyaka can persist being engaged in the assistance of the principal hero, and in that case the designation Patākā may be applied, not of course in the primary sense of the term but simply because it was termed so before. Moreover, the existence of the Patākā in the Vimarśa-sandhi is almost essential according to Abhinavagupta.¹⁷ Then it comes that according to Abhinavagupta the Patākā may exist upto the last Sandhi but the achievement of the Patākā-nāyaka should be depicted before the Vimarśa-sandhi. Viśvanātha also informs us that this is the opinion of Abhinavagupta.¹⁸ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* makes this point more clear. It has got no objection to take the *ān* both in the sense of *abhi-vidhi* and *maryādā*. According to the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* thus, the achievement of the Patākā-nāyaka may be depicted in any one of the first four Sandhis. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* further states that the Patākā as means, helps the main action and as such the achievement of the desired object of the Patākā-nāyaka cannot be depicted in the Nirvahana Sandhi where the final attainment of the main hero is to be shown.¹⁹ This seems to be the most reasonable view. The *Daśa-rūpaka* is silent regarding the duration of the Patākā, so also the position of the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* and the *Nāṭaka-candrikā*.

Regarding the extent of Patakā's duration Sāgara remarks : *sā ca garbhe avamarśe ca nivartata iti nātyantīkam etad avagantavyam.*²⁰ This refers to the precept "āgarbhād āvimarśād..." of the *Nāṭya-sāstra* as quoted above. Sāgara takes the precept to allude to the subsidiary action and not to the achievement of its hero as taken by Abhinavagupta and Rāmacandra-Guṇacandra. He means to say that the operation of the Patakā need not be necessarily completed in the Garbha or Vimarśa Sandhi, i.e., it may continue further.²¹

In conclusion it may be pointed out that any achievement of the desired object by a Patakā-hero is purely incidental. The presence of more than one motif in a drama has never been favoured in India either in practice or in theory. There are many Patakā-nāyakas having no personal interest in Sanskrit Plays. In case of military alliance the dramatists generally depict some sort of *svārtha-lābha* of the Patakā-nāyaka through the cooperation of the main hero. This is done simply to convince the audience that the alliance between the Patakā-nāyaka and the main hero is strong enough to withstand the trial of adversity. Vibhīṣaṇa and Sugrīva, two well known Patakā-nāyakas of Rāma-plays, are depicted as assisting Rāma whole-heartedly being highly grateful by latter's co-operation in their own cause. The gain of Makaranda in the *Mālati-Mādhava* has been shown just to heighten the effect of the drama by introducing parallelism. The gain of the Patakā-nāyaka is to be depicted logically before or in the Vimarśa-sandhi because for the sake of *vinipāta-pratikāra* ; the help of the Patakā-nāyaka is essential here as stated by Abhinavagupta. Moreover, there are many Patakā-nāyakas like the Vidūṣakas or ministers in Sanskrit dramas, in whose cases no achievement is depicted. Thus the achievement of the Patakā-nāyaka is purely an incidental affair and Sāgara seems to have found no necessity of mentioning this point particularly. The *Nāṭya-sāstra* also does not state anything explicitly regarding the matter.

Prakarī (Incident)

Sāgara quotes the definition of Prakarī from the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and his gloss on the same¹ means that the Prakarī should have no uninterrupted development (*nairantaryena Pravartanam tena vihinam*), and that its necessity is for the sake of other's interest. That the Prakarī serves other's interest only comes from its derivative meaning according to Abhinavagupta.² The duration of the Prakarī is also very short. These are the two characteristics which differentiate it from Patākā. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* maintains that the Prakarī is not essential like the Patākā in a drama.³ But it will be shown that even the Patākā is not *avasyambhāvi* in every drama or even every Nāṭaka. From Dhanañjaya's definition of the Prāsaṅgika-vṛtta as given before, it appears that like Patākā the Prakarī may have its *svārtha* a view which is supported by none. The general opinion regarding the Prakarī is that it is almost an interesting casual incident occupying a small portion of the whole action.⁴

Sāgara upholds the utility of Prakarī as a decorative device of the plot and says that like a floral design (*puṣpa-prakara*) it produces beauty.⁵ The *Bhāva-prakāśana* seems to have taken up this idea of floral decoration but have gone a step further. It says that as flowers and *akṣatas* are for the beauty of the religious rites so also the description of the Prakarī in a composition.⁶

As an example of the Prakarī Sāgara cites the incident of Rāvaṇa and Jaṭāyus from the *Kulapatyaṅka*. The same illustration has also been cited by Śāradātanaya and Viśvanātha.⁷ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* too, maintains that in Rāma-plays the character of Jaṭāyus is Prakarī.⁸ Vāsudeva in the *Veṇī-saṃhāra* is a Prakarī-nāyaka according to Abhinavagupta.⁹

Kārya (Denouement, Object, Purpose to be achieved)

Every Sanskrit drama, as a rule, ends in some sort of achievement of the hero which is called *phala-yoga*. In our

previous discussion on the fifth Avasthā, it has been shown that the dramatist also aspires for the attainment of the same end. Kārya may be described as the end both on the part of the principal hero of the drama and the dramatist himself.

Sāgara takes Kārya in the sense of the main purpose to be served in a drama i.e., the main undertaking for which the action begins and when it is accomplished, the drama ends. Now it is generally found that many purposes are served at the conclusion of the action. For example, the death of Rāvaṇa in a Rāma-play may serve several purposes like the recovery of Sītā, the killing of an enemy the gods and country alike, the victory of Dharma etc. But the poet aims at one as the main and there may be subsidiary purposes which enrich the main purpose, says Sāgara.¹ Thus Kārya according to Sāgara is the main purpose for the accomplishment of which the action begins and ends when it is finally accomplished. At the conclusion the true nature of the Kārya is revealed to the audience.

In support of his view Sāgara quotes from the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, and as a gloss adds that there are two Kāryas, one is Ādhikārika and the other is Prāsaṅgika.² Here Kārya seems to be correlated with the *itivṛtta* which has got two elements Ādhikārika and Prāsaṅgika.³ Sāgara's treatment of the matter here is a bit of confused nature. the word Kārya has been used here loosely. According to Sāgara Arthaprakṛtis are elements of the plot, as discussed above; Kārya being an element cannot be taken to be the entire plot. Perhaps Sāgara means to say here that Kārya as an Arthaprakṛti is the purpose related to the Ādhikārikavṛtta; otherwise the entire *itivṛtta* is Kārya i.e., for some purpose. The main purpose in a drama is represented as served with the final achievement of the main hero. The main hero is one, says Sāgara who brings the representation of the drama invested with Bīja, Bindu etc., to a close and by whom everything is represented as completed. He also enjoys, adds Sāgara, the fruit (*phala*) in the form of Dharma (doing good to others), Kāma

(winning the desired woman) and Artha (attainment of something rare).⁴ Thus a subtle difference between the Kārya and Phala has been drawn by Sāgara.

It has been shown before that Abhinavagupta takes the Arthaprakṛtis as means. So, Kārya as an Arthaprakṛti is definitely means according to Abhinavagupta. What can be made out of the confused text of the *Abhinava-bhārati* is this :

In the achievement of the hero various means in the form of resources, both physical and mental, and their proper employment are represented as adopted by the Pradhāna-nāyaka, Patākānāyaka and Prakarī-nāyaka (*pradhāna-nāyaka-patākānāyaka-prakarī-nāyakaiścetana-rūpaiḥ*). The Bija is the chief of all these means (*pradhānasya bījā-khyopāyasya*) and all other means which contribute to the final fruition of the Bija, constitute what is meant by Kārya.⁵ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* follows this opinion of Abhinavagupta.⁶ "But this meaning of Kārya," points out Dr. Kulkarni, is rather unusual and even the *Abhinava-bhārati* and the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* not to speak of other theorists, take the term Kārya to mean Phala or Sādhyā in the treatment of Avasthās and Sandhyāṅgas.⁷ It is evident that there is a confusion regarding the exact implication of the Kārya. Abhinavagupta takes all the Arthaprakṛtis as means (*phalaketavaḥ*), but Kārya has been taken in several places of the *Abhinava-bhārati*, to mean Phala. Now the Phala and Phala-hetu cannot be the something. The position of the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* also is similar to that of the *Abhinavagupta*. Dhanañjaya and Dhanika frankly asserts that Kārya is nothing but the Phala which is Trivarga in the form of Dharmārthakāma.⁸ Here also the inconsistency is apparent, as according to the *Daśarūpaka* also the Arthaprakṛtis are means. *Rasārṇava-sudhākara*, and *Nāṭaka-candrikā*, also take the word Kārya to mean Phala and according to the former the Phala is Trivarga.⁹ According to the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* the Arthaprakṛtis are parts of the story and how part of the story can be regarded as the Phala is not known to us. The *Bhava-prakāśaṇa* takes Sādhyā, Kārya and Phala

in the same sense and this Phala is Trivarga.¹⁰ Śaradā-tanaya mitigates the confusion as he, following Sāgara, takes the Arthaprakṛtis as elements of the plot (katha śarīra hetavaḥ).

Dr. Kulkarni points out that Prof. H. K. Dhruva's attempt to draw a distinction between Kārya, the object of the play, and Kārya the Arthaprakṛti is baseless.¹¹ According to Dr. Kulkarni "Kārya is the main drive for the hero's action and as such a means to the end." The said scholar further observes, "The *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* gives slaying of Rāvaṇa as an example of the Kārya. Taking a clue from it one may say that with the killing of Rāvaṇa, Sītā's recovery is as good as achieved which is the fruition of the Bija. Thus Kārya may be taken as the event immediately antecedent to the final fruition (Phalā-gama)".¹² It may be pointed out in favour of Abhinavagupta that there is no material difference between the means and the Phala. Bija the chief of the means transforms into Phala with the assistance of other means, and Kārya is nothing but this transformation and as such it is a *hetu*.

As a resumé of the above it may be said that in Indian dramaturgy there are as good as three different schools of thought regarding the exact implication of the term Arthaprakṛti which has already been discussed above. That the Patākā and Prakarī constitute what is called the Ānusaṅgika or Prāsaṅgika-vṛtta is accepted by all including the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. Curiously enough the Bhāva-prakāśaṇa includes the Patākāsthānakas with Patākā and Prakarī as constituting the Prāsaṅgika-vṛtta. But this theory of Śara-dātanaya is supported by none.

Sāgara concludes his discussion on the Arthaprakṛtis with the remark that sometimes one of these five may get prominence and the others may become subordinate.¹³ In his support he quotes from the *Nāṭya-śāstra* a verse which means that anyone of these five Arthaprakṛtis may get prominence in cases where some special purpose is served by it and is deemed more useful, the others becom-

ing subordinate.¹⁴ Abhinavagupta in his commentary on the same verse remarks that unlike the five Kāryāvasthās which are equally essential in every drama, any Arthaprakṛti may become main when it serves the purpose of the hero best; others though they may exist become as non-existent. But Bīja, Bindu and Kārya are essential in every case though there may be prominence of the one over the other.¹⁵ In short, the prominence of particular Arthaprakṛti in a drama depends, according to Abhinavagupta upon its usefulness in serving the interest of the main hero. Sāgara is silent about the problem whether the Pataḥkā or Prakarī or the both may be absent in a plot. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* clearly states that if not required by the main hero, the Pataḥkā and Prakarī may be omitted altogether. Where the hero does not require any help then only the three means Bīja, Bindu and Kārya may serve the purpose. Bīja and Bindu are considered to be *mukhya* by the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa*, as they pervade the entire plot. Among the rest the Kārya may be regarded as more prominent. Ramachandra refers to his drama Satyahariścandra, where there is no Prasāṅgika-vṛtta.¹⁶

According to the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* the Pataḥkā and Brakarī are always subsidiary and even Bīja etc., in some places may come under the subsidiary division, the *aṅga*.¹⁷ But this is undoubtedly a view finding support from none.

CHAPTER IV

SANDHIS

The division of the plot into Sandhis and Sandhyaṅgas is the most elaborate system of analysis of the action of a drama. The *Nāṭya-śāstra* gives no general definition of the Sandhis which, however, receives special care in the hands of later authorities. Sāgara defines Sandhi as the joining together of different purposes of the same plot.¹ The plot in its development serves different subsidiary purposes at different stages: Sandhis join them all and direct the whole towards the final end. To make this position more clear Sāgara refers to the view of an anonymous authority which says that these (divisions) are called Sandhis as the purposes are joined together by them.²

Abhinavagupta seems to mean by Sandhi, the joining together of the different parts or phases (*avayava*) of the main purpose (*artha*) in its progress towards being finally served and as such, each part or phase is called a Sandhi.³ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* states this more directly as: *sanddhayo mukhya-vṛttamśāh*. In their exposition of this definition the authors follow Abhinavagupta closely.⁴

The view that the Sandhi is the connection of parts of the plot of a drama, is accepted by the *Daśa-rūpaka* also. According to the *Daśa-rūpaka*, as interpreted by Dhanika, the different parts of a dramatic plot having their secondary ends, are linked together as they all contribute towards the same end, evidently the final one and this is Sandhi.⁵ This view may be said to be a development of the one held by Abhinavagupta inasmuch as, how the connection is established has been stated here. The *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* simply repeats the statements of Dhanañjaya and Dhanika, while the *Bhāva-prakāśaṇa* gives an elaborate and versified form of the same.⁶ Commentators like Rāghava-bhaṭṭa and Dhundirāja follow the *Daśa-rūpaka*.⁷ The *Daśa-rūpaka* in

another place uses the word Sandhi to mean a section of the plot of a drama.⁸ This also is the view of Bhoja.⁹

According to the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* the Sandhi is the connection of subsidiary ends (*avāntarārtha-sambandha*) for the sake of the final end (*mukha prayojanavaśāt*) in the matter of linking together of different parts or sections of the story (*kathāṅgānām samanvaye*).¹⁰ It is interesting to note here that the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* takes up the views of the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* and *Daśa-rūpaka* both, and gives an original explanation of the Sandhi.

A further probe into the explanations given above discloses a clear development of the idea behind the implication of the word Sandhi. It appears that at first it was taken to be a connection of subsidiary purposes in the development of the dramatic plot by some authorities as stated in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*, while others took it to be a linking up of the different parts or sections of the story and the *Abhinava-bhārati* and *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* followed this view. The latter idea i.e., the view followed by Abhinavagupta was further developed by Dhanañjaya and Dhānika. The *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* closely followed by the *Nāṭaka-candrikā* evidently took up both the original views and made a successful attempt to give a fuller definition of the Sandhi. Thus, with the story-element in mind, Abhinavagupta and Rāmachandra-Guṇacandra analyse the plot into five Sandhis ; Sāgara does the same keeping the different purposes served in different parts of the story before his mind's eye. The *Daśa-rūpaka* elaborates the former view and the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* accepts the both and arrives at a synthesis. The word 'juncture' or 'critical juncture', is generally used as an English equivalent of Sandhi. But Sandhis are not merely joining points. The word Sandhi in Sanskrit dramaturgy denotes both linking up of the parts, and also the parts themselves.

The idea of the so-called three unities is conspicuous by its absence in Indian dramatic tradition. On the other hand special stress is given on the unity of impression both in theory and in practice. The plot of a drama

according to Indian theorists should have a steady progress from the beginning to the denouement through the *Avasthās*. The five *Arthaprakṛtis*, as has already been shown, go on moulding the plot in its elaboration from the genesis and finally in its conclusion to a particular achievement. In this progress of the plot, maintain Indian theorists, special care is to be taken so that the unity of impression is maintained throughout. The conclusion should be depicted as following naturally from the beginning, *Viśākṣadatta* expresses this idea in a dramatic way through the dialogue of a minor character, *Samidharthaka* ; *tā kiṃ nimittam kukavi-kida-naḍnassa via annam muhe annam nivahane*.¹¹ The different subsidiary episodes and incidents, as well as the different phases of the main story should all be delineated to yield a single and logical conclusion and nowhere the chief interest should be shifted from the central theme or lost sight of. It follows from what little has been said about the *Sandhis* above, that the theory of the structural analysis of a dramatic plot into *Sandhis* evolved out in Indian dramaturgy in pursuance of the above ideal of unity. The five *Sandhis* are *Mukha*, *Pratimukha*, *Garbha*, *Vimarśa* (*Avamarśa*, *Āmarśa*) *Upasamhṛti* or *Nirvahaṇa* and they should occur in a drama in the same order in which they are enumerated.¹²

It is a matter of common sense that all the five *Sandhis* cannot occur in any and every type of drama (*rūpaka*). As a matter of rule, says *Sāgara*, a *Nāṭaka* should contain five *Sandhis*. He quotes here a verse from the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, which means that as a rule a drama should contain five *Sandhis* but due to some reasons it may contain less. The reason according to *Sāgara* is the brevity of the subject matter.¹³ In the matter of elision of a *Sandhi* or *Sandhis* the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, as quoted in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*, enforces a rule. When only one *Sandhi* is to be omitted the fourth one (*Vimarśa*) gets the preference. In the case of elision of two *Sandhis*, the third and the fourth (*Garbha* and *Vimarśa*), in that of three the second, third and the fourth (*Pratimukha*, *Garbha*, *Vimarśa*) are elided.¹⁴ It is

evident that the first and the last (Mukha and Nirvahaṇa) Sandhis cannot be omitted. The theory is based on sound practical reason. Every plot, if it is to be treated in a drama, must have a beginning and an end.¹⁵ Elaboration, however, may be curtailed.

If, however, says Sāgara, the subordinate theme serving the interest of the principal one is extensive enough then the five Sandhis can be delineated and in that case the above rule regarding the elision of Sandhi or Sandhis should not be taken as necessary.¹⁶ Sāgara here seems to be of opinion that the number of Sandhis in a drama depends upon the extent of the Prasaṅgika-vṛtta; it may be five or less according as the subsidiary portion of the plot is short or extensive. In support of this view Sāgara quotes from the *Nāṭya-śāstra* :

*prāsaṅgike parārthatvān-na tveṣa niyamo bhavet /
yad vṛttaṃ tu bhavet kiṃcit tadyojyam avirodhataḥ ||*¹⁷

eṣa niyamo in the verse has evidently been taken by Sāgara to refer to the *niyama* of the elision of Sandhi or Sandhis as presented in the verse immediately preceding this one (GOS. XIX. 18) in the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. Thus the first half of the above verse, according to the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kosa* means, that the rule regarding the elision of Sandhi does not apply to the subordinate plot as it exists for the main plot. The second half of the verse has been taken to mean that the whole action should be depicted in compatibility with the Sandhis.¹⁸ It thus appears that according to Sāgara the brevity of the subject matter is the reason behind the elision of Sandhi or Sandhis and that the rule of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* regarding the omission of Sandhi is not applicable in the delineation of subordinate plot. If the subordinate plot is extensive enough, five Sandhis may be used in a drama and the whole action should be depicted in conformity with the Sandhis. The whole thing as presented by Sāgara, becomes unintelligible. If the rule regarding the elision of Sandhi is not applicable in the cases of delineation of the subordinate plot, how then may its extent be regarded as the factor for the use of all the Sandhis.

The above verse of the *Nāṭya-sāstra* has evidently been misconstrued in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*. The verse does not refer to the rule regarding the elision of Sandhi, as taken by Sāgara. Abhinavagupta rightly takes the verse to refer to the general principle (NŚ. GOS. XIX. 17) that as a rule a drama should contain five Sandhis. According to Abhinavagupta the verse means that in the delineation of the subordinate plot the said rule (i.e., drama should contain five Sandhis) is not applicable and the subordinate plot should not be incompatible with the main plot.¹⁹ Regarding the elision of one or more Sandhis Abhinavagupta refers to the view of his preceptor according to which the *itivyākṛta* should always be consisting of five Sandhis, as no action can be completed without the five Avasthās, and Sandhis are correlated with the Avasthās. Thus, as per rule, the plot of a drama according to Abhinavagupta, consists of five Sandhis but due to some reasons, i.e., when the plot is not *Pūrṇāṅga*, it may contain less.²⁰ Where the main plot is extensive enough, five Sandhis may be used.²¹

According to the *Nāṭya-sāstra*, the *Nāṭaka* and *Prakaraṇa* are regarded as *Pūrṇāṅgarūpaka* and these two types contain all the five Sandhis. The *Vimarśa-sandhi* is absent in the *Ḍima* and *Samavakāra* while in the *Vyāyoga* and *Īhāmrga*, *Garbha* and *Vimarśa* both are omitted. The *Prahasana*, *Vithī*, *Aṅka* and the *Bhaṇa* contain only two Sandhis, the *Mukha* and *Nirvāhaṇa*, the *Pratimukha*, *Garbha* and *Vimarśa* do not occur in these types of *rūpakas*.²²

As a resumé of the above discussion it may be said that every dramatic plot should contain at least two Sandhis, *Mukha* and *Nirvāhaṇa*, there are exceptions regarding the use of other three Sandhis in dramas. Sāgara takes the Sandhis as connecting different purposes served at different stages in the progress of the action as a whole and he opines that the existence of one or two or of all the three Sandhis other than the *Mukha* and *Nirvāhaṇa*, depend upon the extent of the subsidiary episodes whose purposes are served before the conclusion. The theory, as has been shone,

cannot be deduced from the verse, *prasaṅgike pararthatvāt* etc., of *Nāṭya-śāstra*. Abhinavagupta and others maintain that the Sandhis connect the different parts of the main plot and the extent of which, evidently, determines the number of Sandhis in a particular drama. The *Nāṭya-śāstra* enjoins definite rules regarding the omission of the three Sandhis, Pratimukha, Garbha and Vimarśa.

Some modern critics [of Sanskrit drama maintain a sceptic attitude about the Sandhis. Prof. Jagirdar rightly observes that the Sandhis are ways of knitting the incidents of a drama but his theory of parallelism between the five Sandhis and five members of a syllogism in Indian logic²³ cannot be accepted and the theory has been ably refuted by Dr. Kulkarni.²⁴ Dr. Kulkarni further and rightly asserts that neither the five Sandhis are conceived in analogy to the five parts of the human body nor their names owe their origin to those parts of the body, as suggested by Dr. Pandey.²⁵ Keith remarks, "The classification of elements of the plot is perhaps superfluous besides the junctures".²⁶ If the Arthaprakṛtis are taken as five sections of the plot, as done by the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* the statement is justified. But they are accepted as elements of the plot by Keith himself.²⁷ How these elements can be considered as superfluous beside the Sandhis is unintelligible to us.

View of Māṭṛgupta on Sandhis

Regarding the treatment of Sandhis by Māṭṛgupta, Dr. Raghavan observes. "In lines 459-534 the NLRK, enables us to appreciate the independence of and resource with which Māṭṛgupta discussed the fundamental concept of the five. Ignoring the sixty-four elements or limbs of the five juncture the Sandhyaṅgas, Māṭṛgupta gave two kinds of analysis of the five Sandhis, one somewhat detailed and the other concise. Though brief when compared with the Sandhyaṅga method of treatment, the first exposition analysed each Sandhi into three phases, giving a crucial place to the Artha-

prakṛti and the Avasthā. In a still more concise analysis, in a single verse, he showed that the action in a play, like all action, fell into five phases : agent, means, end, achievement, and enjoyment.¹ It is evident from this remark of Dr. Raghavan that the view of Mātrgupta is of special interest and deserves special attention.

An exposition of the text of the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* containing Mātrgupta's view and Sāgara's gloss on it, is difficult due to the random use of *daṇḍas* (many of which have been suggested to be removed by Dr. Raghavan) and underlinings. M. Dillon informs us that the technical term in the manuscript of the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* marked red, have been underlined by him.² But in this portion of the text some underlined words do not appear to be technical terms and this will be shown in proper places. The text of Mātrgupta as quoted in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* here, is also found in the *Saṅgīta-dāmaḍara*, of Śubhāṅkara, a theorist from Bengal, who perhaps, lived in the 15th Century A.D.³ Śubhāṅkara's reading differs very little from that of Sāgara.

Mātrgupta, as it appears from the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* describes each Sandhi as having three aspects and in most cases the aspects themselves have also been described but whether any order among them is intended to or not, is not clear. The Mukha-sandhi has been defined as :

*prārthanāviśayautsukyam ārambho hetucintanam /
bijaṃ sādhyopagamanam mukha-sandhiriti trayam ||*⁴

In the gloss of Sāgara, on this verse, three words Ārambha, Hetucintana and Bija are underlined⁵ and as such can be accepted as names of three aspects of the Mukha-Sandhi. According to Dr. Raghavan, however, the names of the aspects are Prārthanā, Ārambha and Bija.⁶ The text is amendable to both the interpretation. But in every case the names of the aspects are given in Sāgara's gloss in the first case-ending. If Dr. Raghavan's suggestion is accepted the name Prārthanā becomes missing. On the other hand, an attempt of defining the aspects, though not of all, has been made in the quoted portion of Mātrgupta's text. If

Ārambha is taken as the name of an aspect, the aspect Hetucintana remains undefined. From the text of Sāgara, however, Ārambha instead of Prārthanā appears to be the name of the aspect. It is better to interpret the text as it is, of course if there arises no incongruity in doing so.

The above verse of Mātrgupta means that Ārambha, i.e. the yearning for the desired object (Prārthanā-*viṣayautsukyam*) the reflection upon the cause and the germ, (Bīja) i.e., the indication of the end, are the three aspects of the Mukha-sandhi.⁷ The Act I of the Nāṭaka *Māyā-madālasā* has been cited as an illustration of the Mukhasandhi. Sāgara remarks that here Ārambha is the eagerness of the king Kuvalayāśva to go to the penance grove in response to the entreaty of the sage Gālava, wishing the death of 'Tālaketu. Then a verse is quoted in which the sage says that they themselves are capable of restraining the demon, but this is the duty of the king, so, the king should accompany him. Here, comments Sāgara, due to the reference of 'rājadharma' the king reflects on the cause of his forest sojourn and thinks that one sixth of the merit of the sacrifice performed, will be accrued to him, and this is Hetucintana. Then Sāgara quotes another verse in which the abduction of Madālasā has been referred to. According to Sāgara, the recovery of Madālasā is the fruit, the germ (Bīja) of which is sown here by the reference of Madālasā's abduction by Tālaketu.⁸ Thus, according to Mātrgupta, eagerness for a move, reflection on the cause of the move and an indication of the final end, are the three aspects of the Mukha-sandhi. From the illustrations, cited by Sāgara above, it appears that these three phases may occur in the order in which they are enumerated. It is interesting to note here that there is no reference to Rāsa in Mātrgupta's description of the Mukha-sandhi. The text, as we have it, in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kōśa*, is silent whether the genesis of the plot has got any connection with the Rāsa or its origination and development.

Pratimukha-sandhi

The definition of the Pratimukha-sandhi has been given as :

*lābhaḥ sādhanā-sampattiḥ prasaraḥ prasṛtā kriyā /
binduḥ sādhanā-sambandhaḥ iti pratimukhe trayam //*⁹

In Sāgara's gloss on this verse the underlined words are *sādhanā-sampatti*, *prasara* and *sādhanā-sambandha*. But, *Lābha*, *Prasara* and *Bindu* appear as technical terms here.¹⁰ *Lābha* (gain) is *sādhanā-sampatti* which according to Sāgara, consists in the acquisition of the desired object through means. This may be called the initial success. In the second Act of the said drama, relates Sāgara, the king kills Tālaketu with an arrow given by the sage, and marries Madālasā. This is gain through means (*sādhanā* here is the arrow).¹¹ *Prasara* consists in the extension of the action (*prasṛtā-kriyā*) which has been illustrated where Pātālaketu, the brother of Tālaketu, prevents Madālasā from going. The act of hostility is thus further extended after the initial success.¹² *Bindu* has been described by Mātṛgupta as *sādhana-sambandha* i.e., relation or association with the means. *Bindu*, maintains Sāgara, is illustrated in the same Act where Pātālaketu renews the act of hostility by making a fresh attempt in abducting Madālasā as is expressed in the speech of Madālasā, *ajjautta paritāyāhi* etc., and this is *sādhanā-sambandha* as Kuvalayaśva takes up bow and arrow immediately, as it is expressed in his speech.¹³ Thus according to Sāgara the entire Act. II of the drama *Māyamadālasā* is the second Sandhi which consists of initial success, further extension of the action and a fresh employment of means. The aspects here explain a gradual development of action. After the initial success of the hero, the playwright extends the action by introducing fresh obstacles and depicting the hero as conscious about the employment of new means which is *Bindu*. It may be pointed out here that Abhinavagupta also interprets *Bindu* as hero's knowledge of the connecting link consisting in the employment of means.¹⁴

Garbha-sandhi

The Garbha-sandhi has been described by Māṛgupta as :

*sambhogo yogyatā tatra udbhedaḥ siddhidarśanam /
mitra-sampat patāketi trayam garbhe prakīrtitam* ||¹⁵

In the gloss of Sāgara on this verse, there are as many as five underlined words all of which cannot be accepted as technical terms as both Māṛgupta and Sāgara explicitly state that the Garbha-sandhi also consists of three phases.¹⁶ Moreover, Sāgara does not use the word *patākā* at all in his gloss, though it is a common technical term in dramaturgy. Here Mitra-sampat is the technical term intended for perhaps, just to avoid a confusion as, *patākā* is not used here in the sense of, *vyāpīprāsaṅgika-ṛtta*, in which it is generally used.

The Act III of the same drama *Māyāmadālasā*, according to Sāgara constitutes the Garbha-sandhi. Sambhoga seems to be the name of the first aspect which is but only *yogyatā tatra*, Sambhoga here in this Sandhi is to be taken in the sense of suitability of enjoyment and not in the sense of actual enjoyment, i.e., a situation where enjoyment is possible. Thus the first aspect of the Garbha-sandhi may be taken as the prospect of enjoyment. This is illustrated in a verse where the hero expresses his desire for amorous play. Udbheda has been described by Sāgara as the happening of unwished for separation and this is illustrated in the speech of Madālasā where she says, "My right eye throbs."¹⁷ The throbbing of the right eye of a woman is an evil omen. The *siddhi-darśana*, says Sāgara, is the counteraction of that evil omen, as in the speech of the king "May the throbbing be for good omen."¹⁸ Udbheda and Siddhidarśana combine to make the second aspect. It appears that this aspect signifies the foreshadowing of a fresh mishap and its counteraction. The third aspect is Mitrasampat which has been termed as Patākā. This is illustrated in the friendly behaviour of the Fire in not burning Madālasā who fell into it by the black magic of Kuṭilaka. Thus the third Sandhi

according to Mātr̥gupta consists of the prospect of enjoyment, fresh chance of mishap and its counteraction and the making of friends. All these have been shown as occurring in the above order in the drama.

Vimarśa-sandhi

Vimarśa has been described as :

nāśaḥ kārāṇa-vaidhuryaṃ kiṃci-cchreyaḥ savighnatā | punarbijena sampattir-vimarśe tritayā (m) bhavet ||¹⁹ Sāgara's gloss on this runs : *caturthe anke madālasāyā nāśo darśitaḥ | sa ca rājñah mukhya-kārāṇasya vaidhuryaṃ bhavet | tatraiva bṛhadaśvena pitu-stapaḥ-phalaṃ kathayato rājñah śreyaḥ kathitam | tatra ca gṛhamāniya tasya samarṇayatyeti savighnatayā (pā) tālaketu-prabhṛtinām vadhe bijasya sampattiriti trīyuto vimarśaḥ* ||²⁰ Here also all the underlined words cannot be taken as technical terms. The entire Act IV of the drama comprises the fourth Sandhi. The first aspect of this Sandhi is Nāśa which is a bereavement to the main cause of the action i.e., hero, and is illustrated in the (temporary) loss of Madālasā. The second aspect is a bit of good fortune for the hero though the obstacle continues. This is illustrated in the statement of Bṛhadaśva reporting the fruit of his father's penance which seems to be capable of warding off the evils. But the obstacle is there, as the body of Madālasā is to be brought to the palace of the king. The third element, i.e., the nourishment of the germ is illustrated in the killing of Pātālaketu and others. Thus a temporary loss or mishap to the hero, a bit of good fortune accompanied by obstacles and the nourishment of the germ, represented through the removal of obstacles are the aspects of the Vimarśa-sandhi according to Mātr̥gupta.

Nirvahaṇa-Sandhi

The last Sandhi has been described as :

*abhipretārtha-sampattiḥ siddhiḥ sādhyasya siddhatā |
prārabdhasya ca nīrvāho bhaven-nīrvahāṇe trayam ||*²¹

The three aspects of the last sandhi appear to be the accomplishment of the desired object, success and the carrying out of the undertakings. The first aspect is illustrated in the return of the victorious prince Subāhu and revival of Madālasā. Siddhi is the attainment of the purpose. In the drama Māyāmadālasā the destruction of the demons, according to Sāgara, is the main purpose (sādhyā) and this has been represented as served. The third aspect has not been illustrated particularly. Sāgara says that the harmonious carrying out of all the undertakings has been shown clearly.²²

Mātrgupta's method of analysis of the plot of a drama, as discussed above, is quite novel. It avoids the Sandhy-aṅgas of Bharata and describes each Sandhi as consisting of three aspects. The names of only three Arthaprakṛtis, Bīja, Bindu and Patakā occur as characteristic marks of the first three sandhis respectively. But all these terms are not used here exactly in the same sense as in the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. Dr. Raghavan maintains that in describing the Sandhis Mātrgupta gives a crucial place to the Arthaprakṛtis and Avasthās,²³ But it has been shown that out of five, three Arthaprakṛtis have been connected with three Sandhis respectively. The names of the Avasthās or any reference to them do not occur at all in Mātrgupta's description of the Sandhis

It has also been shown that the *Samgita-dāmodara* also contains Mātrgupta's description of the Sandhis. Śubhaṅkara at the beginning of his work refers to the sources from which he has drawn his materials and here with others the name *Ratnakośa* occurs.²⁴ This *Ratnakośa* is undoubtedly the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* from which Subhaṅkara seems to have taken directly in several occasions including the lines containing the theory of Mātrgupta as discussed above.²⁵ The differences in readings may be attributed to the scribe's fault. It is really surprising and significant also that the

theory, on no less an important topic than Sandhis and propounded by an authority like Mātrgupta who has been generally accepted as living in Kashmir in the 7th century A.D.; was known to none but a Bengali theorist of the 15th century and most probably through the work of Sāgara.

Appendix

All the Sandhis and their aspects, as described by Mātrgupta have been illustrated by Sāgara with citations from the lost drama Māyamadālasā. The *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* informs us that it is a Nāṭaka consisting of five Aṅka the hero is present.²⁶ From the citations in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* the plot of the Nāṭaka may be reconstructed for a clear understanding of Mātrgupta's standpoint, as the following :

A c t—I

A sage, named Galava came to the king Kuvalayāśva and informed him that the demon king Tālaketu, the son of an *asura's* daughter and ruler of a region near the eastern mountains, was creating hindrances to sacrifices and had abducted Madālasā, the daughter of Menaka and *mānasī śikhināḥ sūtā*.²⁷ The sage expressed his desire that the king should accompany him in the forest to punish the demon. Presumably, the king went with the sage.

A c t—II

The sage helped the king with a deadly arrow by which the king killed Tālaketu and married Madālasā. But Pātālaketu, the brother of Tālaketu, renewed the hostility and made a fresh attempt to carry away Madālasā.

A c t—III

This act begins with a Praveśaka where a couple of vultures²⁸ describe the battle in which the king came out

victorious. Then follows a scene of love making of the hero and heroine. Then due to the black magic of Kuṭilaka, an accomplice of Tālaketu, Madālasā fell in fire but was not burnt.

Act—IV

Loss, i.e., death of Madālasā took place somewhere outside the palace. The king was informed by Bṛhadaśva of the fruit of his father's penance (by which, perhaps, a dead man could be restored to life or all evils could be warded off) and Pātālaketu was killed.

Act—V

Madālasā was restored to life and prince Subāhu returned after killing the enemy. The demon power was totally annihilated and everything ended harmoniously.

Each Act of the drama comprises a Sandhi. The drama has been cited by no other renowned theorist. Perhaps Sāgara had some special relation to or interest in the drama. It appears that just to illustrate the peculiar dramaturgic conception of Sandhis expounded by Māṭṛgupta the drama *Māyamadālasā* was composed most probably by Sāgara himself or by somebody intimate to him.

The Sādhya-dīpaṅcaka theory

The Sādhya-dīpaṅcaka theory, as found in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* is another novel method of analysis of the plot of a drama.²⁹ According to this theory a dramatic composition, specially Nāṭaka, consists of five elements, viz., Sādhaka (agent, the hero), Sādhana (the chief of the means), Sādhya (the end or the object to be accomplished), Siddhi (success) and Sambhoga (the enjoyment), Sāgara illustrates these five elements from the drama *Bhīmaviṣaya*, hitherto unknown.³⁰ In this drama, says Sāgara Bhīma is the Sādhaka, the mace given to him by Vāsudeva is the Sādhana the killing of Duryodhana is the Sādhya. Siddhi is the installation of Yudhiṣṭhira

on the throne and Sambhoga being the amorous play of Bhīma with Draupadī who has achieved her object. Here it is interesting to note that Siddhi goes to a person other than the Sādhaka who himself, however, gets Sambhoga.

The theory, in fact, has got no connection with the Sandhis excepting that in both cases the number is five. It does not aim at the analysis of the plot and seems to be a rudimentary method of pointing out the elements of a dramatic action with *sambhoga* as the end. In no way, from the text as given in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*, a conclusion can be drawn that Mātr̥gupta defines the Mukha-sandhi and others as dealing respectively with Sādhaka etc., as has been pointed out by Dr S. N. Shastri.³¹

Moreover, from the text of the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*, it appears that the theory has not been given much importance to even by Mātr̥gupta himself, who simply states that some experts describe the pentad of Sādhya etc. So, the theory seems to be older than Mātr̥gupta and cannot precisely be attributed to him.³²

After describing the theory of five Sandhis as propounded by Mātr̥gupta, Sāgara takes up Bharata's method of analysis of a dramatic plot into Sandhis and Sandhyaṅgas with the remark : *samagra-lakṣaṇam nāṭakam-uddidiksūr-ācāryaḥ punar-āha*³³ This statement shows that according to Sāgara, Mātr̥gupta's simpler method of Sandhis falls short in analysing the complex structure of the plot of a Nāṭaka, having all the characteristics, while Bharata's elaborate theory is suitable for that purpose. Mātr̥gupta's own opinion also seems to be the same when he gives importance to the Sandhyaṅgas in describing the Nāṭaka, as quoted by Rāghavabhaṭṭa.³⁴ It is enjoined there that the Nāṭaka should be endowed with the Sandhyaṅgas and these Sandhyaṅgas in no way can be taken to mean the three aspects of each Sandhi of Mātr̥gupta. Neither by Mātr̥gupta nor by Sāgara they are so termed. Evidently, by Sandhyaṅgas in the above description of Nāṭaka, Mātr̥gupta refers to the Sandhi-Sandhyaṅga theory of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. So his shorter scheme of Sandhis seems to be elaborate one of Bharata which is accepted by Mātr̥gupta himself.

A full-fledged drama (*Samagra-lakṣaṇa-nāṭaka* in the words of Sāgara) with all the Vṛttis and Sandhis, admits of many details, varieties of incidents and moods. Here Mātṛgupta seems to have recognised the importance of elaborate Sandhyāṅga theory. Most probably with shorter and simpler dramas in his mind Mātṛgupta who is supposed to have written an independent treatise on dramaturgy,³⁵ formulated his simple scheme. We have seen that Mātṛgupta's Sandhis have been illustrated with reference to the plot of the Nāṭaka *Māyāmadālasā* by Sāgara. The plot of this drama, as has been shown, is neither very extensive nor complex. It thus appears, that Mātṛgupta's theory of Sandhis was formulated, as an alternative one to that of the *Nāṭya-sāstra* for the analysis of the plots of simpler and shorter dramas, or only to show broadly the general course of dramatic action.

Sandhis (as described mainly after the *Nāṭya-sāstra*)

Mukha-Sandhi

Regarding the definitions of Sandhis Dr T. C. Mainkar maintains, "There is very little difference of opinion among the text book writers and Bharata's definitions have been verbally accepted by them"¹ But in the following pages it will be shown that a number of views other than those of the *Nāṭya-sāstra*, regarding the characteristics of the Sandhis, developed in later ages and some of which have been mentioned in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kōśa*.

Sāgara quotes the definition of the Mukha-sandhi from the *Nāṭya-sāstra*,² and takes it to mean, as it appears from his gloss, that the Mukha-sandhi contains the origination of the Bīja which is the source of different *arthas* remaining in harmony in the plot.³ *artha* here has been taken to mean different purpose served at different stages. Thus according to Sāgara, the inception of the Bīja is the cause of the diversification of the plot also, but all these diversities should be in harmony with the main action.

Abhinavagupta gives special stress on the point that the inception of the Bīja is the source of different Rasas originating from diversified facts. He bases his arguments on a different reading of the verse describing Mukha-sandhi in the *Nāṭya-sāstra* from that as found in *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa*.^{3a} According to Abhinavagupta the Mukha-sandhi comprises that section of the plot where the incidents, suitable for the beginning, give rise to various *āsvādas*. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* follows the *Abhinavabhārati* verbatim.⁴ The *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* gives the definition of the Mukha-sandhi from the *Nāṭya-sāstra* but adds no gloss on it. The *Bhāva-prakāśana* also follows the line of Abhinavagupta.⁵ Dhanika makes the point more clear. He maintains that Mukha-sandhi contains the origination of the Bīja and is the source (*hetu*) of different purposes and Rasas. This is also the view of the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara*. So far as the illustration of the Mukha-sandhi is concerned, *Abhinava-bhārati*, *Nāṭya-darpaṇa*, *Bhāva-prakāśana* and *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* cite the Act I of the *Ratnāvalī*.⁷

From the above it is clear that excepting Sāgara all the renowned theorists rightly accept the Mukha-sandhi as the source of different Rasas. It seems that Sāgara in this respect is influenced by Mātr̥gupta who, as has already been shown, maintains a silence regarding the origination of Rasa in the Mukha-sandhi.⁸

From the *Bhāva-prakāśana* we come to know that there was a school of thought which maintained that the origination of the Bīja in the Mukha-sandhi could not be accepted as the source of the Rasas because they are not generally connected with the Trivarga, the main fruit (*pradhānaphala*) of the drama.⁹ Śāradātanaya establishes here a connection of the Trivarga with the Rasas and concludes that the Mukha-sandhi should be considered as the *hetu* of the Rasas.¹⁰ It is, however, not fair to conclude that either Mātr̥gupta or Sāgara belonged to that school of thought which has been criticised by Śāradātanaya as above.

Sāgara refers to the view of some anonymous experts who maintain that the Bindu can be placed together with the Bīja in the Mukha-sandhi, a view which is hitherto

unknown.¹¹ Evidently, this view avoids the correlation between the Sandhis and the Arthaprakṛtis. But the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* says that this is *pakṣāntara* and according to some they come consecutively.¹² This second view is shared by all the theorists and commentators. There are, however, different views regarding the Bindu. It has been discussed in details that as a connecting link Bindu may be of different forms. In case where the main purpose or a single pivotal idea maintains the continuity throughout the action, the Bindu practically finds place in the Mukha-sandhi. This may be illustrated from the *Veṇī-saṃhāra* where the Bindu is placed in the Mukha-sandhi and the matter has been fully discussed.¹³ Sāgara then quotes the view of an Ācārya which states that where the Bīja is indicated through *śleṣa* or *chāya* that is the Mukha-sandhi.¹⁴ By Ācārya Sāgara means to refer Bharata. So, Sāgara maintains that according to Bharata the most important element of the Mukha-sandhi is the inception of the Bīja. Other implications of the view has been fully discussed.¹⁵

PRATIMUKHA-SANDHI

The *Nāṭya-śāstra* defines the Pratimukha-sandhi as :

bijasyodghāṭanam yatra drṣṭa-naṣṭamiva kvacit |
mukhanyastasya sarvatra tadvai pratimukham smṛtam ||

The *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* reads the third pada as : *mukhāhīṭasya sarvatra*.¹ The verse simply means that everywhere in the Pratimukha-sandhi of a drama, the Bīja having its inception in the Mukha-sandhi, goes on sprouting, and in this development it is sometimes lost sight of and sometimes is seen. But this *drṣṭa-naṣṭa* characteristic of the Bīja in the second Sandhi seems to have given rise to a storm of controversies among the theorists. According to Sāgara the Bīja is seen in the form of the cause and is lost from the view in the form of effect. As the Bīja is said to be sown in the Mukha-sandhi, there

it is seen as the cause. But it becomes obscured, as it were, by subsidiary issues which are employed for proper development of the main plot according to Rasa. In the second Sandhi it should be brought into the view again.² From the above it appears that Sāgara, takes the *dr̥ṣṭa-naṣṭa* feature of the Bīja in the sense that it is *dr̥ṣṭa* in the Mukha-sandhi but becomes *naṣṭa* and in the Prati-mukha-sandhi it becomes again *udghāṭita*. Sāgara illustrates this feature of the Bīja from the *Veṇī-saṃhāra*. He points out that in the Act I, the Bīja is seen in the speech of Bhīma where he says, "Shall I not crush the thighs of Suyodhana with my club",³ and in the Act II the same topic of breaking of the thighs is brought to the fore by Kañcukin in his evil-omened utterances.⁴ According to Sāgara the sowing of the Bīja through Śleṣa is done in a verse of the Sūtradhāra where the destruction of the Kauravas has been referred to.⁵ Sāgara seems to mean that the Bīja, sown (i.e., hinted at) in the verse of the Sūtradhāra, becomes known (*dr̥ṣṭa*) in the above speech of Bhīma through the hint to the breaking of Duryodhana's thigh which stands for the total annihilation of the Kauravas i.e., the final event in the affair. Then for sometimes it remains obscured (*naṣṭa*) by subsidiary issues like the love scene between Duryodhana and Bhānumatī, and is again made prominent through the utterances of Kañcukin.

Abhinavagupta refers to as many as six views including his own regarding the *dr̥ṣṭa-naṣṭa* feature of the Bīja and refutes five of them. The first three of these views are :

- (i) *kāryatayā dr̥ṣṭam kārāṇatayā naṣṭam* (seen as an effect and veiled as a cause). This view seems to be similar to that held by Sāgara so far as the approach is concerned.
- (ii) *upādeye dr̥ṣṭam heye naṣṭam* (seen in the acceptable but obscured in the unacceptable).
- (iii) *nāyaka-vṛtte dr̥ṣṭam pratināyaketivṛtte naṣṭam* (seen in the plot connected with the hero but not seen in that of his opponent).

All these interpretations have been rejected by Abhinavagupta on the ground that they overlook the unity of action and fail to explain *naṣṭa*.⁶

(iv) The fourth view noted by Abhinavagupta which seems to be the Siddhānta-pakṣa, maintains that the unveiling of the Bīja is a particular state contributing to the final fruition, and even though the Bīja is seen it remains obscured due to the presence of opposing forces. The unveiling of the Bīja is like the sprouting of the seed covered by dust.⁷ As an illustration, Abhinavagupta quotes the verse *aśaṣṭra-grahanād* etc., of the Kañcukin from the second Act of the *Veṇī-saṃhāra*. Abhinavagupta introduces a counter argument that according to some, here the rise of the Pāṇḍavas indicated in the Mukha-sandhi is perceptible (*drṣṭa*) due to the death of Bhīṣma and imperceptible (*naṣṭa*) due to the slaying of Abhimanyu, as both the incidents are mentioned in the verse cited above for illustration. But in that case, according to Abhinavagupta, the significance of *iva* in *naṣṭamiva* is overlooked.⁸ Abhinavagupta seems to maintain that in the above illustration from the *Veṇī-saṃhāra* the sprouting of the Bīja (i. e., *pāṇḍavābhyudaya*) is indicated by the reference to the death of Bhīṣma, while the reference to the killing of Abhimanyu screens it for the time being, i. e., it becomes *naṣṭamiva* and not actually *naṣṭa* as stated in the counter-argument.

(v) Some others maintain that *drṣṭatā* and *naṣṭatā* are features useful respectively in the Pratimukha and Avamarśa. So, *drṣṭanaṣṭatva* is a matter of degree; the Bīja though *drṣṭa* in the first stage, appears to be *naṣṭa* when compared with the next stage, as it goes on developing.¹⁰ But Abhinavagupta remarks, *atrāpivārtho na saṃgacchata eva*¹¹, i. e., the significance of *iva* is overlooked.

(vi) The view of Śaṅkuka and others, as put in the *Abhinava-bhāratī* seems to take *drṣṭanaṣṭamiva* to mean slight visibility. But Abhinavagupta rightly remarks that this is *ekadeśa-lakṣaṇam*,¹² evidently because the feature of *naṣṭatva* has been overlooked here.

Abhinavagupta then clarifies his own standpoint. He

maintains that the Bīja is sown in the Mukha-sandhi as to be seen and veiled as it were, by subsidiary incidents which, however, contributes to its further development. The analogy is derived from a seed, sown and covered by dust that contributes to its sprouting. The Pratimukha-sandhi represents a steady manifestation of the Bīja like the sprouting of the saffron seeds. In the opinion of Abhinavagupta this can be derived from the etymological explanation of the term Pratimukha as : *pratirābhimukhyena yato'tra vṛttiḥ* i.e., where the progress (of the Bīja) is favourable.¹³ Abhinavagupta illustrates this progress of the Bīja from the *Ratnāvalī*.¹⁴ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* follows this interpretation of Abhinavagupta and cites the same illustration with a clear exposition. It says that in the Mukha-sandhi of the *Ratnāvalī*, the Bīja is sown in the Act I by the minister while stating *dvīpādanyasmādapi* etc., and then it is screened by spring festival etc. But in the Pratimukha-sandhi the sprouting of the Bīja is shown in the Act II by the meeting of the hero and heroine through the endeavour of *Susaṅgatā*.¹⁵ It appears that according to Abhinavagupta *dr̥ṣṭānaṣṭatva* of the Bīja is a regular feature in the Mukha-sandhi and it is immaterial in the second Sandhi where the steady progress of the Bīja is delineated. This seems to be indicated by the word *kvacit* in the definition of the Pratimukha-sandhi found in the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, as stated above.

Daśa-rūpaka and the *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* avoid the word *dr̥ṣṭa-naṣṭa* and use *lakṣyālakṣya* instead, while the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* and the *Nāṭaka-candrikā* use *dr̥śyādr̥śya* in their description of the state of the Bīja in the Pratimukha-sandhi. The *Bhāva-prakāśana*, on the otherhand, uses both *lakṣyālakṣya* and *dr̥śyādr̥śya*.¹⁶ The *Bhāva-prakāśana* explains *dr̥śyatva* as *prayojanānām niṣpatti* and *adr̥śyatva* as the want of that.¹⁷ According to these works the development of the Bīja in the Pratimukha-sandhi is represented as perceptible and imperceptible by turns and this is the characteristic of this Sandhi.

From the above discussion it becomes clear that the *Nāṭya-śāstra* in defining the Pratimukha-sandhi presents a

riddle, so to say, and all the later authorities appear to have tried hard to solve it, each in his own way and thus giving rise to a host of views discussed above. Sāgara himself neither follows any of the above views nor is followed by any.

Mātṛgupta, as discussed above, tactfully avoids the expression *dr̥ṣṭa-naṣṭa*, but the aspects *lābha* (initial success) and *prasara* (further extension of the action) in his description of the Pratimukha-sandhi, may be accepted as a reasonable explanation of Bharata's above riddle. The Bīja in its progress may be said as visible (*dr̥ṣṭa*) when the hero attains some sort of success at the initial stage of the play. But the drama cannot end there. The playwright introduces fresh hurdles on the way of the hero and the theme continues and thus the object of desire (Bīja) is pushed back far beyond the reach (*naṣṭa*). Mātṛgupta, as it appears from the above, in his attempt of explaining the Sandhis in his own way, could not totally avoid the influence of Bharata's text.

GARBHA-SANDHI

The Garbha-sandhi occupies the middle part of the play and the name according to Sāgara owes its origin to this position by analogy of a human body.¹ The *Nāṭya-śāstra* as quoted in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kōśa* defines Garbha-sandhi as the part of the plot where the Bīja sprouts and where there are attainment, frustration and again pursuit². The Bīja, having its inception (*utpatti*) in the Mukha-sandhi, is brought into view (*udghāṭana*) in the Pratimukha-sandhi and it sprouts further (*udbheda*) in the Garbha-sandhi. Sāgara says : *mukha-pratimukhābhyāṃ mukhotthānasya bījasya yatra udbhedaḥ prakāśanam*³. Garbha-sandhi thus represents further manifestation of the Bīja than in the Pratimukha-sandhi. Abhinavagupta, followed closely by the authors of the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa*, more explicitly says that the Bīja having [its origin in the Mukha and sprouting in the Pratimukha

develops further in the Garbha-sandhi towards the production of the Phala.⁴ The *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* also means the same and attempts to explain the Garbha-sandhi with the help of a popular etymology *phalasya garbhikarāṇād garbhaḥ*.⁵

The three words of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* *prāpti* (attainment), *aprāpti* (frustration) and *anveṣaṇa* (pursuit) in the above definition of Garbha-sandhi have given rise to controversies among theorists. Abhinavagupta offers two views, and from the printed text it is difficult to ascertain which one he himself prefers. According to the first of these two views *prāpti* is concerned to the *nāyaka* (the hero) and *aprāpti* is in relation to the *pratināyaka* (villain, the chief opponent of the hero) while *anveṣaṇa* is concerned to the both.⁶ The view seems to maintain that the third Sandhi describes some sort of gain to the hero and loss to his main enemy, both striving to accomplish their own ends. But, remarks Abhinavagupta, as this explanation suits well in cases of *Vīra* and *Raudra* Rasas only, others maintain that the Garbha-sandhi represents gain, loss and pursuit by turns and as it co-exists with the third Avasthā it produces the embryo of the Phala, the final attainment.⁷ This Sandhi, according to this view, thus brings out the prospect of final attainment of the hero. So, the loss, gain and pursuit are all related to the hero. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa*⁸ simply repeats what is stated in the *Abhinava-bhāratī*. This Sandhi has been illustrated by Abhinavagupta from the second and part of the third Act of the *Ratnāvalī* where the meeting and separation between the hero and heroine have been represented several times.⁹ The *Daśa-rūpaka* as interpreted by Dhanika, the *Bhāva-prakāśana*, the *Sāhitya-darpaṇa*, the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* and the *Nāṭaka-candrikā* follow this view in different words. Bhoja-deva also maintains this view.¹⁰

Abhinavagupta further maintains that the third Avasthā i.e., the *Prāpti-sambhava* represents only a possibility of gain and not its surety and as the Garbha-sandhi correlates to this Avasthā, the presentation of the loss is essential here. In the *Avamarsa-sandhi*, on the other hand, the prominence is given to the gain over the loss.¹¹

Regarding this problem of *prāpti* and *aprāpti* in the Garbha-sandhi, Sāgara maintains a different view which has not even been referred to in any of the above works. According to Sāgara, dramatic plots either describe obligation or prohibition; the former takes the form of gain and the latter that of loss. As an illustration of the first form Sāgara presents an *anuṣṭubh* verse containing both definition and illustration.¹² This verse itself yields no easy exposition. It seems to mean that the Bīja, i. e., the destruction of the demons which has already begun, becomes obligatory to Rāma due to the abduction of Sītā by Rāvaṇa. This is an instance of *prāpti*-(*vidhi*)-*rūpa*-*vastu*. This form of the *vastu* appears to be illustrated in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kosa* by a quotation from the drama *Jānakī-rāghava* in which Sugrīva says that by carrying away Sītā Rāvaṇa has provoked Rāma's hatred for his own destruction.¹³ The second form, i. e., the *aprāpti*-*rūpa*, has been illustrated by an analysis of the plot of the drama *Tāpasa-vatsarāja*. Here the separation of (loss, *aprāpti*) Vāsavadattā from the king Udayana deeply engrossed in her love, has been shown to be brought about by the minister through the pretext of the burning of Lāvaṇaka when the country was attacked by the enemy. The pursuit has been shown in the practice of penance by the king.¹⁴

It is difficult to form any clear idea regarding Sāgara's conception of the Garbha-sandhi from the above. He seems to mean that the characteristic *prāpti* of the Garbha-sandhi occurs in dramas where the deeds of the hero are represented as of obligatory nature, while *aprāpti* consists in the separation of the hero from his beloved. Thus the representation of *prāpti* or *aprāpti* in the Garbha-sandhi depends upon the nature of the plot, some dramas show *prāpti* and some *aprāpti*. This explanation is quite novel and is unknown to the theorists and commentators.

From the standpoint of Mātṛgupta *prāpti* may be taken to mean prospect of enjoyment (*sambhoga-yogyatā*) and *aprāpti* may be explained as fresh chance of mishap (*udbheda*). The counteraction of this fresh chance of mishap and

making of friends (*mitrasampat*), as described by Māṭṛgupta may be said to be corresponding to *anveṣaṇa* (pursuit) in the definition of Garbha-sandhi of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.¹⁵

VIMARŚA OR AVAMARŚA

Bharata's definition of the Vimarśa-sandhi, as quoted by Sāgara, is very knotty and defies a satisfactory interpretation.¹ Abhinavagupta himself criticises as many as five expositions and offers his own. But from none of these the exact reading of the verse can be determined. No explanation of the word *vilobhanakṛta* is found in any of the views referred to by Abhinavagupta. Similar is the position of the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*. The definition means that where the *bījārtha* disclosed in the Garbha-sandhi, becomes either *vilobhanakṛta* or connected with the *āśleṣa* of that (*tasya*), is Vimarśa. Sāgara himself says that Vimarśa is connected with the embrace (*āśleṣaṇa-samyukta*) of something creating confusion or perplexity to the *bījārtha* disclosed by the Garbha-sandhi.² Abhinavagupta refers to a view which takes Avamarśa in the sense of *vighna*, obstacles. He further adds that according to this view here Bīja in the Bharata's definition is to be taken to mean the fruit of the Bīja and *artha* to mean *nivṛtti*.³ Thus, *bījārtha* means the fructification of the Bīja. With the help of this exposition Sāgara's above statement may be taken to mean that the Vimarśa-sandhi presents the fructification of the germ as led astray. The full implication of Bharata's definition of the Vimarśa-sandhi, as quoted in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* is now clear. The Garbha-sandhi describes further progress of the Bīja than in the Pratimukha-sandhi towards the production of the fruit. In the Vimarśa-sandhi, according to this view this progress is represented by the dramatist as led astray or, as perplexed or, beguiled fully (*vilobhanakṛta*) or partially (*tasya vāśleṣa yukta*). It thus appears that though not explicitly stated, Vimarśa has been taken by Sāgara here in the sense of *vighna*. The causes of *vighna* have not been mentioned in connection with this view in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-*

ratna-kośa, where two other views on the Vimarśa also occur. In simple words, this view maintains that the progress of the action towards the final achievement is depicted in the Vimarśa-sandhi as totally or partially arrested. Abhinavagupta, however, clearly points out that the obstruction may be created by such causes as anger, temptation (created by the opponent), misfortune, curse etc.⁴ Viśvanātha appears to be the most consistent author who expressess very clearly that the Bīja (chief of the means) in the Vimarśa-sandhi manifests further than in the Garbhā-sandhi but fresh obstructions due to curse etc., are put before its fructification.⁵ The illustration is also very clear. In the *Abhijñāna-śakuntalā* the entire portion beginning from the fourth Act where Anasūyā says: *pīamvade ja-i-vi gandhavēṇa vivāheṇa* etc., to the seventh Act upto the recognition of Śakuntalā, comprises the Vimarśa-sandhi, as this portion is *śakuntalā-vismaraṇa-rūpa-vighnālīngitaḥ*.⁶ From the *Abhinava-bhārati* it appears that the view has not been fully discarded by Abhinavagupta.⁷

Sāgara himself seems to have given little support to the view discussed above, as no illustration has been cited. He presents another view, as said by others. This view maintains that the Vimarśa-sandhi depicts a state of obscurity (*samvṛti*) so far as the progress of the action towards the final achievement is concerned. This obscurity arises out of heroes' deliberation over diversified purposes. The enemy of the hero here is made to suffer a heavy loss also.⁸ Due to the multiplication of subsidiary issues the central portion of the plot of a drama is elaborated to its best and the main purpose may be represented as branching towards many directions. Gradually these subsidiary issues merge to the main plot and produce a single result. This elaboration and ramification of the main purpose should be completed before the close of the Vimarśa-sandhi so that a clear and steady progress towards the final end may be depicted in the last Sandhi. Thus, in the second half of the third Sandhi and in the first half of the fourth Sandhi the plot of a drama reaches to the highest degree of com-

plexity. The *Nāṭya-śāstra* gives clear direction to the dramatist that the achievement, if there be any, of the *Patākā-nāyaka* should be delineated before the close of the *Vimarśa-sandhi*.⁹ Due to this elaboration and diversification the hero is generally depicted in the *Vimarśa-sandhi* as brooding over the facts for finding out a right direction. Thus, reflexion is said to be the nature of the *Vimarśa-sandhi* by Śaṅkuka as stated by Abhinavagupta. Reflexion or deliberation, maintains Śaṅkuka, may be due to various reasons as temptation, anger, misfortune etc.¹⁰ Abhinavagupta, however, refutes this view on the ground that deliberation is not limited to this *Sandhi* only and as such, it cannot be taken to be the characteristic of the *Vimarśa-sandhi* only.¹¹ Udbhaṭa's view also, as represented by Abhinavagupta, seems to be similar to the above one, refuted by the latter. According to Udbhaṭa, in the *Vimarśa-sandhi*, the hero being obstructed in the course of his pursuit after the desired aim, broods over the situations.¹²

The theory that deliberation constitutes the chief feature of the *Vimarśa-sandhi* has been supported not only by pre-Abhinavagupta authorities like Śaṅkuka and Udbhaṭa but also by post-Abhinavagupta theorists like Dhanika, Bhoja, Śāradātanaya, Śingabhūpāla and Rūpa-gosvāmin. The *Daśa-rūpaka*, as interpreted by Dhanika, maintains that deliberation due to *krodha* or *vilobhana* characterises the *Vimarśa-sandhi*.¹³ The *Bhāva-prakāśana* gives two definitions of the *Vimarśa-sandhi*; one of which is verbally quoted from the *Daśa-rūpaka* and the other states the same thing in different words.¹⁴ The *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* followed by the *Nāṭaka-ṇḍīkā* maintains the same view.¹⁵

The *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* contains another description of the *Vimarśa-sandhi*. According to this description, doubt (*sandeha*) appears to be the distinguishing feature of the *Vimarśa-sandhi*.¹⁶ In this portion of the plot, maintains some, the final accomplishment though seems to be within the reach, is presented as doubtful due to some turn of facts. This final fruition (*phalāgama*) becomes doubtful after the *Garbha-sandhi*, upto which the progress is

unhampered. Simply speaking, the Vimarśa-sandhi puts up the last hurdle on the way of final fruition of the Bīja and naturally a doubt arises in the mind of the audience regarding the end of the drama. The hero himself is depicted as doubtful regarding the accomplishment of his desire. This doubtful state, says Sāgara may be depicted as the result of temptation, perplexity, anger or mishap. Sāgara illustrates Vimarśa through *vilobhana* from the *Rāghavābhyaśa*, where Rāvaṇa with the intention of making a false peace, presents to Rāma a demoness Jālinī by name who takes the form of Sītā. Thus the demons here through temptation cause doubt in the mind of Rāma regarding the course to be adopted.¹⁷ The *krodhaja-vimarśa* is said to be illustrated in the seize of the capital of the king of the Vatsas by the enemies.¹⁸ The *vyasanaja-vimarśa* has been illustrated from the Act VI of the *Veṇī-saṃhāra* by quoting the verse, *tirṇe bhīṣma-mahodadhau* etc.¹⁹ The situation refers to the mace-duel between Bhīma and Duryodhana which causes a doubt in the mind of Yudhiṣṭhira.

Abhinavagupta himself maintains that doubt is the nature of Vimarśa.²⁰ From the standpoint of Abhinavagupta it may be said that the third Avasthā (Prāptyāśā) coexists with the third Sandhi (Garbha) and as such, it describes a possibility of attainment (*sambhāvanā*). The Vimarśa-sandhi coexists with the fourth Avasthā (Niyatāpti) where *saṃśaya* (doubt) preponderates. *Samśaya* is possible even after *sambhāvanā* if some unforeseen obstacle is put on the way of the final achievement. Through the medium of a highly scholastic discussion Abhinavagupta conveys that at this stage the forces, in favour of and opposed to the progress of the action towards the planned end, are depicted as of equal strength and as such, a doubtful situation is created. This gives a scope to the hero for the display of his best parts in overcoming the obstacles and creates a suspense, so essential for the success of a drama.²¹ Thus from the standpoint of both the hero of the drama and the audience Vimarśa-sandhi depicts doubt (*sandeha*).

On a perusal of Abhinavagupta's view, it appears that though *sandeha* is the chief characteristic of the Vimarśa-sandhi yet *vighna* is there as the *sandeha* is caused by some sort of *vighna*.²² This point is made clear by the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* where the authors give almost equal stress on *sandeha* and *vighna*,²³ otherwise they follow the *Abhinava-bhārati* closely.

The above discussion proves that there has been a controversy regarding the correct interpretation of Bharata's definition of the Vimarśa-sandhi and Abhinavagupta seems to have discussed and criticised the views separately, while Sāgara appears to have arranged them into three groups. Sāgara refers to three views without entering into the critical task of evaluating their merits and it is not possible to find out his own opinion regarding the matter. It is interesting to note that all the three views given in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* are deduced from the same definition of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* as is evident from the *Abhinava-bhārati*. The three views with their adherents may be arranged in the following way :

1. *Vighna* is the main feature of the Vimarśa-sandhi. Only Viśvanātha is the consistent supporter of this view. Sāgara presents this view as that of Bharata-muni.
2. Deliberation (*paryālocana*) is the nature of Vimarśa-sandhi. This view has been supported by the majority of theorists including Śaṅkuka, Udbhata, Dhanika, Śāradātanaya, Śiṅgabhūpāla and Rūpa-gosvāmin.
3. Doubt (*sandeha*) is the chief feature of the Vimarśa-sandhi. This view finds strong support from Abhinavagupta and Rāmacandra-Guṇacandra. Sāgara illustrates Vimarśa according to this view.

Now, it may be pointed out that *sandeha* and *vimarśana* (*anveṣaṇa*, *paryālocana*) differ very little in sense and both originate where there is a scope of *vighna* so far as the plot-construction of a drama is concerned. *Vighna* gives rise to doubt in the mind which causes deliberation. From the standpoint of the audience it may be said that the

Vimarśa-sandhi presents obstacles to be overcome on the way of the final achievement, i.e., the fructification of the germ. Judged by the mental state of the hero it may be said that in the Vimarśa-sandhi he is depicted as perplexed due to the doubtful situation created by opposing forces and as such, brooding over the situations to find out the way. From both objective and subjective standpoints it appears that *vighna* forms the basis for the delineation of the Vimarśa-sandhi. *Vighna* creates a doubtful situation. Udbhaṭa and Śaṅkuka, two almost contemporary authors, appear to have taken into consideration the reaction of the mind of the hero at this situation while describing deliberation as the main characteristic of the Vimarśa-sandhi. Abhinavagupta taking the situation into consideration describes it as *sandehātma*. Dhanika, Śāradātanaya etc., cling to the old view of Udbhaṭa and Śaṅkuka. Viśvanātha describes the Vimarśa-sandhi taking into consideration the root cause of the *sandeha* and *paryālocana*. Sāgara most cleverly supports all the views, as it appears from the text of the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*. In conclusion it may be pointed out that Mātṛgupta also enumerates, as shown before, obstacle connected with a bit of success as one of the three aspects of the Vimarśa-sandhi. It appears thus probable, that chronologically also the views may be arranged in the same way as has been done above.

NIRVAHAṆA-SANDHI

Sāgara gives the definition of the Nirvahaṇa-sandhi, evidently from the *Nāṭya-śāstra* :

*samāptih samyagarthānām prastutānām mahāujasām/
nānā-bhāvottarāṇām ca bhaven-nirvahaṇam tu tat||*¹

Sāgara's comment on this verse means that where the *arthas* (purpose) of the Bija etc., introduced previously are represented as finally served, is called the Nirvahaṇa-sandhi.² It has already been shown that the Arthaprakṛtis

according to Sāgara are elements of the plot.³ He thus seems to mean that in the last Sandhi the purposes of all the elements of the plot are represented as fully served. Everything comes to a conclusion here. Different elements of the plot, according to this view, are introduced to serve different purposes. A proper delineation of these elements in a Nāṭaka assumes a great proportion (*mahaujasām*) and give rise to varied mental states *nānābhāvottarāṇām*. The final achievement in the Nirvahaṇa-sandhi marks the fulfilment of all these purposes. Mātrgupta also maintains, as has been shown,⁴ that the Nirvahaṇa-sandhi is characterised by the accomplishment of the desired object and a successful carrying out of all the undertakings. Sāgara's interpretation of Bharata's definition of the Nirvahaṇa-sandhi seems to be influenced by the view of Mātrgupta.

Abhinavagupta strongly supports the theory of correlation of the Sandhis with the Avasthās. He takes the word *artha* in the definition of the Nirvahaṇa-sandhi to mean Avasthā and maintains that the first four successive Avasthās corresponding to the first four successive Sandhis depict the gradual transformation of the Bija and thus give rise to the state of excellence as the basis of aesthetic experience (*camat-kārāspadatve jātōtkarṣāṇām*) through the delineation of varied mental states (*krodhādibhirbhāvaiḥ*). That part of the plot where they culminate to produce the fruit, is the Nirvahaṇa-sandhi, covered by the Phalajogāvasthā.⁵ Abhinavagupta presents another explanation of this sandhi, said to be the view of others. The word *artha* has been taken in the sense of *upāya* (means) in this explanation. According to this view the Nirvahaṇa-sandhi depicts the success of the chief means, set forth in the Mukha-sandhi in producing the desired *phala*.⁶ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* describes the Nirvahaṇa-sandhi after the first view of Abhinavagupta.⁷

Later authorities closely follow the line of Dhanañjaya, who himself seems to be influenced by the above view. According to Dhanañjaya the Nirvahaṇa-sandhi is that portion of the plot where the purposes of four other sandhis,

containing the Bīja and distributed in due order, are brought together to produce one result, i. e., the final end.⁸ The *Bhāva-prakāśana* gives this definition verbally. The *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* reproduces both the text of Dhanañjaya and commentary of Dhanika verbatim. The *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* and the *Nāṭaka-candrikā* also follow the *Daśa-rūpaka*.⁹

From above discussion it appears that the chief mark of the Nirvahaṇa-sandhi is that herein the playwright depicts the final achievement. The successful carrying out of all undertakings, the fulfilment of all purposes, the production of the fruit, success of the means,—all mean the something, the achievement of the desired object from the standpoint of both the playwright and the hero of the play. Bhoja also means the same when he says :—*kriyāphalena samyag-yogo nirvahaṇam*.¹⁰ The last portion of the drama Ratnāvalī beginning from the entrance of the magician comprises the Nirvahaṇa-sandhi.

The *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* records two post-Bharatan views which deserve special attention. Sāgara says that some favour a brief recapitulation of the course and conclusion of all the Sandhis in the last Sandhi.¹¹ Abhinavagupta also refers to this view, as maintained by some.¹² This view seems to be given importance to in the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa*, and the illustration has been cited from the *Satya-hariścandra* of Rāmacandra himself.¹³ The other theory, recorded in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* advocates the introduction of another obstacle in the Nirvahaṇa-sandhi, put on the way of the final success of the hero. The fire-ordeal of Sītā has been cited as an example of this theory.¹⁴ This introduction of an eleventh hour tragic complication increases tension and saves the play from a tame and commonplace ending.¹⁵

From Bharata's analysis it appears that in the Garbha-sandhi the plot takes a definite shape and the audience can form an idea of what is to follow. To keep alive the interest of spectators unforeseen obstacles are put forward in the Vimarśa-sandhi, where the progress of the action towards the desired end is represented as checked. The

curse of the sage Durvāsa in the *Abhijñāna-śakuntala* and the capital punishment of Cārudatta in the *Mṛcchakaṭikā* may be taken to be good examples of this unforeseen obstacle. But when this obstacle in the *Vimarśa-sandhi* is surpassed, the course of the action acquires momentum and proceeds without interruption till the conclusion is reached. Now, after the *Vimarśa-sandhi* which is full of actions due to the tussle between the opposite forces and the victory of the one favourable to the cause of the hero over the unfavourable ones; the *Nirvāhaṇa-sandhi* becomes tame. There remains nothing interesting, as the audience can fairly guess the conclusion. A short recapitulation of the entire action, referred to by Sāgara is of little help, as it fails to create any new interest. This device may simply explain the entire course of the action by giving the synopsis of the former events and connecting them with the conclusion, and perhaps owes its origin to the attempt of the dramatists in showing the inevitability of the conclusion, which is so important for the success of a drama. Dramas like the *Mudrā-rākṣasa* of Viśākhadatta, where the course of the action is too intricate to be followed by the audience, also require a brief recapitulation of the former incidents to show their interrelation. Cāṇakya in the *Mudrā-rākṣasa* discloses to Rākṣasa his plans in the *Nirvāhaṇa-sandhi*. Similarly, Mārīca in the *Abhijñāna-śakuntala* discloses to the hero and heroine the cause of their separation. But in both the cases, particular dramatic interests have also been served by this reference to past events. Rākṣasa should know the circumstances leading to his defeat and should not think himself polluted by the touch of Caṇḍālas before he can accept with a clear mind the post of Amātya under Candragupta. Similarly, a real union between Duṣyanta and Śakuntalā is possible only when the actual cause of their separation is known to both.

Some dramatists, as it appears from the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*¹⁶ took recourse to invent a fresh but momentary complication at the last stage of the action to avoid a tame

denouement. The motif of this device is found in the fire-ordeal of Sītā in the *Rāmāyaṇa*. This portion of the Rāma-story forms the theme of many Rāma-plays. Śūdraka, in his *Mṛcchakaṭīka*, depicts Dhūtā's attempt to commit suicide by entering into fire when all are jubilant at the reunion of the hero and heroine. This device of introducing an "eleventh hour tragic complication" has undoubtedly heightened the tension of the last Sandhi in the *Mṛcchakaṭīka*.

Sāgara records another view according to which, at the concluding portion of the Nāṭaka a god should appear on the stage,¹⁷ evidently to make the finishing more charming. The appearance of Vāsudeva in the *Veṇīsaṃhāra* and that of Gaurī in the *Nāgānanda*, have been cited as examples of the device. Sāgara maintains that the appearance of a god at the last moment in a drama indicates the prosperity (*abhyudaya*) of the hero. The appearance of divine sages, equivalent to gods, also serve the same purpose.¹⁸ The entrance of the divine sage Nārada, just to finalise a happy conclusion in Kālidāsa's *Vikramorvaśī*, may be cited as an example. The above theory seems to be based upon an observation of plots where divinities or divine-sages are presented on the stage at the concluding part of the Nāṭaka for some dramatic purpose and also to enhance the charms of the finishing. It is interesting to note here that Rucipati in his commentary on the *Anar-gha-rāghava* ascribes the view to Bharata and quotes a verse of the same import.¹⁹ This verse is also found in the *Śaṅgīta-dāmodara* of Śubhaṅkara.²⁰ Sāgara also, seems to quote the first hemistich of the verse,²¹ but refers to no authority. These sorts of quotations in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kōśa* which are not ascribed to any authority or introduced with any such expression as *anyastvāha* etc., are mostly found to be taken from the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. It may be surmised that the above verse was current in the name of Bharata in the days of Sāgara.

The above view, however, follows from the dictum of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, quoted in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kōśa* where it is said that in the denouement of all sorts of

compositions there should be the Rasa of wonder (*adbhuta*).²² The sentiment of wonder may be aroused by depicting the occurrence of unexpected things like the appearance of divinities or divine sages on the stage. The re-union of Duṣyanta and Śakuntalā in the hermitage of Mārīca in the *Abhijñāna-śakuntala* and the entrance of real Sītā on the stage in the *Uttara-rāma-carita*, may be cited as apt examples of this theory.

The *Nāṭya-śāstra* with an eye on the possibility of a tame conclusion, further enjoins, as quoted in the *Nāṭaka-laṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* that the composition should take the shape of the end of a cow's tail and exalted ideas should be depicted in the last half of the Nāṭaka.²³ There has been a controversy regarding the implication of the statement that the composition should be like the end of a cow's tail. Śāgara simply says that the first half of the Nāṭaka should be elaborate (*pūrvavhāge vistaraṇīyam*) and the second half compact (*paścārdhe ca saṁharaṇīyam*).²⁴ It has been discussed above that the Garbha-sandhi, occupies the middle portion of the plot and from the Vimarśa-sandhi begins what is technically known in English the Falling action and before that is Rising action according to the G. Freytag's pyramidal structure of the plot of a play.²⁵ The rising action is extended and the falling action is shortened just to keep alive the interests of the spectators as they, to some extent can form an idea of what will follow from the very beginning of the falling action. Abhinavagupta offers two explanations. According to some, the above statement of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* means that the *aṅgas*, evidently the Acts, should gradually be shortened.²⁶ This implies that the first Act of a drama is the longest and the last is shortest. But this carries little sense and is too mechanical and has been hardly followed by dramatists. According to others, informs Abhinavagupta, as some of the hairs at the end of a cow's tail are longer and some shorter, so also some *kāryas* in a drama end in the Mukha-sandhi, some in the Pratimukha, some others last upto the Avamarśa and the rest is completed in the Nirvahaṇa-sandhi.²⁷ The

complicated plot of a Nāṭaka deals with various incidents and their purposes are represented as served in successive stages while the most important ones are retained upto the conclusion. Thus, the second explanation of Abhinavagupta seems to be reasonable.

From the above discussion, it appears that the *Nāṭya-śāstra* in describing the Sandhis takes into account mainly the gradual transformation of the Bīja from its origination to fruition. The Bīja originates in the Mukha-sandhi (*yatra bijasamutpattiḥ*) and goes on sprouting (*bijasyodghātanaṃ yatra*) throughout the Pratimukha-sandhi but fully sprouts in the Garbha-sandhi (*garbha-nirbhinna*). Its progress towards fruition is checked by unforeseen obstacles (*vilobhanakṛta krodhavyasanaja*) in the Vimarśa-sandhi, and finally transforms itself into fruit in the Nirvahaṇa-sandhi.

RELATION AMONG THE THREE PENTADS ; THE AVASTHĀS, SANDHIS AND ARTHAPRAKṚTIS

The analysis of a plot into Avasthās, Arthaprakṛtis and Sandhis has been discussed in details along with the nature and characteristics of each member of the above three pentads. Sāgara follows the *Nāṭya-śāstra* closely in maintaining a silence regarding the interrelation among the three pentads, but other theorists and commentators have worked out different theories, a perusal of which is essential for the proper comprehension of the topics.

Sāgara, as has been shown, takes the five Avasthās in the sense of five successive stages in the development of a plot. Regarding the problem whether these five Avasthās are all present or not in the plot of all types of plays, he states nothing explicitly. The *Nāṭya-śāstra* clearly states that every action must possess the five Avasthās in the same order in which they have been enumerated.¹ But the implication of the expression 'every action' is doubtful and it may be taken to refer to the plots of full fledged dramas like Nāṭaka and Prakaraṇa, having all the Sandhis, or plots of all types of plays. Abhinavagupta seems to support the first explanation

and the point will be discussed shortly. Dr. K. K. Datta Sastri rightly points out² that Bharata, while speaking of the division of plots into Sandhis and Arthaprakṛtis, gives no such special stress as above, and actually sanctions that there may be plots without some of the Sandhis and Arthaprakṛtis. There is, however, no such relaxation, sanctioned by the sage in the case of the Avasthās. The *Nāṭya-śāstra* thus seems to maintain that any type of play must possess the five Avasthās. The silence of Sāgara in the matter, may be taken to be his support to this view.

Sandhis, according to the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* as discussed above, are structural divisions of the plot from the standpoint of different purposes served in the progress of the action. All the authorities, beginning from Bharata, maintain that every type of play does not contain all the five Sandhis. Thus, from the standpoint of the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*, it may be said that the Sandhis may or may not correspond to the Avasthās. For this reason, Sāgara seems to have neither asserted nor denied any correlation existing between the Sandhis and Avasthās. Arthaprakṛtis, according to Sāgara, are essential elements of the plot and are not divisions. So, the question of any correlation of the Arthaprakṛtis, either with the Sandhis or with the Avasthās cannot reasonably be comprehended from the viewpoint held by Sāgara. It is, of course, certain that the feature *bijotpatti* (origin of the germ) occurs in the Mukha-sandhi, but like Bindu (the sign of continuation) the Bīja also continues throughout the play. The Patāka and Prakarī are not restricted to any particular Sandhi in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*. Thus, according to Sāgara there is no necessary correlation among the above three groups of five.

Like the Avasthās, the Sandhis also occur in a drama in the same order in which they have been enumerated. Abhinavagupta holds that each Sandhi rests on the corresponding Avasthā.³ So, according to Abhinavagupta, the types of plays not having all the Sandhis (*hīnasandhi*), cannot have all the Avasthās also. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* closely follows *Abhinava-bhāratī* in this respect and clearly states, *sandhayo mukhyavṛttā-*

*mśāḥ pañcāvasthānugāḥ kramāt.*⁴ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* further maintains that all the five Avasthās occur in the Nāṭaka, Prakaraṇa, Nāṭikā and Prakaraṇī⁵ and as such, all the five Sandhis also occur in these types of plays. Viśvanātha also is a follower of this view and explicitly states that in connection with the five Avasthās respectively, the five sections of the plot constitute the five Sandhis.⁶ Thus, it is not the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* that tries to link the Sandhis and the Avasthās, as maintained by Dr Mainkar.⁷ Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra simply follow the line of Abhinavagupta. Abhinavagupta, himself, however, is not the propounder of this school of thought. He may be said to be the main advocate. The above view has been attributed to his preceptor in the *Abhinava-bhāratī*.⁸ This school of thought thus maintains that :

1. The Mukha-sandhi rests on Ārambha.
2. The Pratimukha-sandhi rests on Yatna.
3. The Garbha-sandhi rests on Prāptyāśā.
4. The Vimarśa-sandhi rests on Niyatāpti.
5. The Nirvahaṇa-sandhi rests on Phalāgama.

The essence of the above theory is that a plot of a full-fledged drama (Pūrṇāṅga-rūpaka) in its development passes broadly through five stages (Avasthā) and each stage is the under-current determining its corresponding Sandhi, a structural division of the plot. From this it, however, cannot be supposed that the doctrine of stages is a later addition to Bharata, as has been done by Dr. Mainkar.⁹

There is another school of thought that advocates almost a mechanical theory of correlation existing among the members of the Avasthās, Arthaprakṛtis and the Sandhis. The *Nāṭya-śāstra* says : *arthaprakṛtayaḥ pañca jñātvā yojyā yathā-vidhi*.¹⁰ The statement means that the Arthaprakṛtis are to be used in a drama according to rules. But there is no such rule (*vidhi*) regarding their order of use in a drama, prescribed in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and the sage seems to have given the playwright a complete freedom. He may use them according to his discretion. Abhinavagupta as the printed text of the *Abhinava-bhāratī* stands, seems to maintain that the five Arthaprakṛtis are to be used in a drama in the same order

in which they are enumerated in the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.¹¹ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* rightly opposes this view and enumerates the Arthaprakṛtis in an order different from that of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. It further declares that their application in a drama may not follow the order of enumeration and also all of them are not essential in every drama.¹² But there are some theorists who maintain that like Avasthās and Sandhis, the Arthaprakṛtis also should occur in a drama in the same order in which they are enumerated, and regarding enumeration they follow the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. Naturally, the theory evolves that each Sandhi rests on the corresponding Avasthā and Arthaprakṛti.

The *Daśa-rūpaka* is generally believed to be the chief exponent of the above theory.¹³ Both Dhanañjaya and Dhanika assert that the five Arthaprakṛtis, combined respectively with the five Avasthās give rise to the corresponding Sandhis.¹⁴ Dhanañjaya further maintains that the *anīyas* of the Mukha and Pratimukha Sandhis are determined by the *samanvaya* of the Avasthās and Arthaprakṛtis concerned.¹⁵ Śāradātanaya, Śiṅgabhūpāla and Rūpa-gosvāmin maintain this view. Bhojadeva also seems to support this view.¹⁶ Commentators like Rāghavabhaṭṭa, Kāṭayavema and Dhunḍi are staunch followers of the above view. Now this theory of correlation may be stated clearly in the following form :

1. Bīja and Ārambha combine to form the Mukha-sandhi.
2. Bindu and Prayatna combine to form the Prati-mukha-sandhi.
3. Patākā and Prāptyāśā combine to form the Garbha-sandhi.
4. Prakarī and Niyatāpti combine to form the Vimarśa-sandhi.
5. Kārya and Phalāgama combine to form the Nirva-haṇa-sandhi.

It has been shown above that according to Abhinavagupta the five Avasthās and their corresponding Sandhis should occur in a *pūrṇāṅga rūpaka* and that all the Artha-

prakṛtis are not essential everywhere like the Avasthās ; the Patākā and Prakarī may or may not occur in a drama.¹⁷ Thus, according to Abhinavagupta the absence of the Patākā and Prakarī does not hamper a drama from being Pūrṇāṅga, having all the Avasthās and their corresponding Sandhis. Abhinavagupta further rejects in unequivocal terms the existence of *yathā-saṁkhyā niyama* among the Avasthās, Sandhis and Arthaprakṛtis.¹⁸ This is also the view of the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa*.¹⁹ The entire theory of correlation of the three pentads has thus been exploded by Abhinavagupta. But it is not mentioned in the *Abhinavabhāratī* that any theorist upholds the view. Abhinavagupta might have fought back either a possible theory or a really existing one. But his method of argument in rooting out all the pre-conditions of the said theory of correlation among the members of the three pentads in a drama, seems to pre-suppose the existence of such a theory at his time.

It is curious to note that Dhanañjaya, the chief exponent of the above theory of correlation admits that the Patākā may or may not occur in the Garbha-sandhi²⁰ and keeps silent as to the position of the Prakarī in a drama. Śāradātanaya maintains that in the Garbha-sandhi the Patākā does not occur in some dramas like the *Mālavikāgnimitram* and does occur in sum dramas like *Mālatīmādhavam* and as such, the occurrence of the Patākā in the Garbha-sandhi is optional. This view has been attributed in the *Bhāva-prakāśana* to Kohala.²¹ If Śāradātanaya is to be believed, then Kohala may be said to have assigned the place of the Patākā, if it occurs at all, in the Garbha-sandhi.

Inconsistently enough, the *Bhāva-prakāśana* further maintains that the Prāptyāsā should occur in the Garbha-sandhis and in the absence of Patākā, sometimes either the Bīja or Bindu should be used there.²² The *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* also maintains the same view.²³ The above theory of correlation cannot stand if the Bīja or the Bindu is allowed to occur in the Garbha-sandhi unless Śāradātanaya admits that these two may occur more than once in a drama which

again goes against the main thesis of correlation. Like the *Daśa-rūpaka*, the *Bhāva-prakāśana* also maintains silence regarding the position of the Prakarī in a drama. It thus appears that the *Daśa-rūpaka* and the *Bhāva-prakāśa*, though uphold the above theory of correlation, they do not try to invest it with a mechanical perfection disregarding the characteristics of the subsidiary elements, the Patākā and Prakarī. They are inconsistent, so far as they maintain that each Sandhi is formed by a combination of the respective Avasthā and Arthaprakṛti and at the sametime declare that the Patākā may or may not occur in the Garbha-sandhi and observe silence regarding the place of the Prakarī, which according to their theory should occur in the Vimarśa-sandhi.

Śingabhūpāla seems to have given the above theory a mechanical perfection. He repeats what has been said by the *Daśa-rūpaka*, regarding the determination of the *aṅgas* of Mukha and Pratimukha Sandhis, but asserts that the *aṅgas* of the Garbha and Vimarśa Sandhis also depend upon the combination of the Prāptyāsā with the Patākā and that of the Prakarī and the Niyatāpti respectively.²⁴ Most inconsistently the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* follows the *Daśa-rūpaka* and the *Bhāva-prakāśana* in maintaining that the Patākā may or may not occur in a drama.²⁵ The *Nāṭaka-candrikā* closely follows the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* and adds that the *aṅgas* of the Nirvahaṇa-sandhi depend upon the combination of the Kārya and the Phalāgama.²⁶ Śingabhūpāla and Rūpago-svāmin are apparently consistent inasmuch as they take the Arthaprakṛtis as sections of the plot, which of course is opposed to the Bharatan conception, as pointed out before.²⁷

Among the commentators, Rāghava-bhaṭṭa, Kāṭyavema and Dhunḍi are staunch supporters of the above theory. Rāghava-bhaṭṭa follows the *Daśa-rūpaka* so far as the dependence of the *aṅgas* of the Mukha and Pratimukha Sandhis is concerned, but takes resort to the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* to show that the *aṅgas* of the Garbha and Vimarśa Sandhis also similarly depend upon the combination of the *Avasthās* and Arthaprakṛtis concerned.²⁸ It is also interesting to note that

the *Mātalivṛttānta* is not a *Prakarī* according to Rāghava-bhaṭṭa, simply because it occurs at the close of a Sandhi and the *aṅgas* of the *Vimarśa-sandhi* do not depend on it.²⁹

Kaṭayavema follows mainly the *Bhāva-prakāśana* in his commentary of the *Mālavikāgnimitra* and maintains that the *Garbha-sandhi* in this drama depends upon the correlation of the *Prāptyāsā* and *Bindu*.³⁰ In connection of the *Vimarśa-sandhi* of the said drama, he says that here it is *Vimarśa-sandhi*, as the *Bīja*, occurring in the due place of the *Prakarī* is connected with the *Niyatāpati*.³¹ Dhunḍi in his commentary of the *Mudrārākṣasa* connects all the *Arthaprakṛtis* with the respective *Avasthās* and *Sandhis* and in this respect he follows the *Rasārṇana-sudhākara*.

The *Nāṭya-śāstra* represents a tradition, developed through centuries. It does not seem to betray any predilection towards the views that connect the *Sandhis* either with the *Avasthās* or with the *Avasthās* and *Arthaprakṛtis* both. Practically speaking, none of the above terms have been defined in the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. Later authorities defined them in their own way and different views evolved, as have already been discussed. From their treatment in the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, it appears that the *Avasthās* may correspond to the *Sandhis*, though no hard and fast rule can be formulated. The *Arthaprakṛtis* are quite different things and all of them cannot reasonably be comprehended to coexist with either the respective *Avasthās* or *Sandhis*. This seems to be the most ancient view which has been reproduced by Sāgara.

As the number of members of these three groups is five, a tendency developed from an early age to establish a mutual relation among them. Śaradātanaya, as has been shown, records the view of Kohala regarding the position of the *Patākā* in the *Garbha-sandhi*. It has also been shown that according to the preceptor of Abhinavagupta each *Sandhi* rests on the corresponding *Avasthā*. Māṭṛgupta, as discussed above, in his treatment of the first three *Sandhis* gives crucial position to the *Bīja*, *Bindu* and *Patākā* respectively. These three *Arthaprakṛtis* are not taken there exactly in the same sense in which they are used in the *Nāṭya-śāstra*,

at least as interpreted by Abhinavagupta, Sāgara and others. Some other authority perhaps, drew inspiration from Kohala and Mātṛgupta and also being tempted by the word *yathavidhi* in *arthaprakṛtayaḥ pañca jñātvā yoḥyā yathāvidhi* of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. (GOS. XIP. 10), took the Arthaprakṛtis also to occur in a drama in the very order in which they are found to be enumerated in the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. A tendency naturally developed to correlate the members of these three groups of five. The final result of this tendency is found in the doctrine that each Sandhi rests on the corresponding Avasthā and Arthaprakṛti. Dhanañjaya, so far as the available texts are concerned, is the earliest exponent of this theory. But from the criticism of Abhinavagupta, as discussed above, it appears that the theory is much more older. Dhanañjaya and Śara-dātanaya, however, could not give the theory of mechanical perfection which work was completed by Śiṅgabhūpāla. Commentators mostly followed this absurd mechanical theory of correlation simply out of loyalty to the theorists who preceded them.

ANUSANDHI

The *Nāṭya-śāstra* says that the Patākā (*vyāpi-prāsaṅgika-vṛtta*) may contain one or more Sandhi or Sandhis, but as they are subservient to the interest of the main, they are called Anusandhis.¹ Abhinavagupta informs us that Lollaṭa and others favour an analysis of the portions of the plot dealing with the Patākā-nāyaka, into Anusandhis.² Abhinavagupta himself rejects the idea of taking the Anusandhis into account, because the Patākā itself serves the interests of the main hero. Moreover, if a Patākā is to be fully treated with, then it should be provided with another Patākā, thus giving rise to the *anavasthā-doṣa*.³ In principle, however, Abhinavagupta accepts that the Patākā-vṛtta may contain sandhi or sandhis, as any and every episode may contain five Avasthās on which the Sandhis are based, but he finds no necessity of enumerating them as they are all for the main plot.⁴

Following the *Abhinava-bhāratī* the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* makes the point more clear. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* calls the Anusandhis as Gaṇa-sandhis, because they are dependant to the Sandhis of the main plot and as such, they deserve no separate treatment and are mainly hinted at or may be inferred. The problem of Anusandhi does not arise at all with regard to the Prakārī due to its shortness.⁵

The *Daśa-rūpaka*, on the otherhand, maintains that the Patākā-vṛtta should contain Anusandhis, whose number should be less than that of the main Sandhis by one, two, three or four, but the Prakārī should be used without any Sandhi.⁶

The attempt of analysing the Patākā-vṛtta into Sandhis is mainly due to its extensive character. The problem, however, seems to have had its origin to the fact that the Sandhis have been taken to be concerned to the main plot only by a school of thought to which Abhinavagupta and Rāmacandra belong.⁷ Sāgara takes the plot as a whole in his analysis of it into Sandhis, as discussed above. From his standpoint the question of the Anusandhi does not arise at all. This seems to be the reason behind its omission in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*.

CHAPTER V

Sandhyaṅgas

Āngas of the Mukhasandhi

Sāgara quotes the definitions of the Sandhyaṅgas from the *Nāṭya-śāstra* in almost all cases and illustrates them adding a short gloss on each. There are casual references to other views also.

1. Upakṣepa : Upakṣepa is defined as the beginning of the play.¹ Herefrom the Kāvyaṛtha starts. As an illustration of the Upakṣepa, Sāgara quotes the verse, *nirvāṇa-vairadahanāḥ* etc., from the *Veṇī-saṃhāra*.² The verse practically occurs in the Prastāvanā and is put into the mouth of the Sūtradhāra. Sāgara, however, says that the illustration is given from the first Act of the drama *Veṇī-saṃhāra*.³ Thus the Prastāvanā also is taken into account in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* while analysing the plot into Sandhis. Abhinavagupta and Rāmacandra take strong objection to this method.⁴ Abhinavagupta illustrates Upakṣepa with the verse : *lākṣā-grhāṇalaviṣāṇa* etc., the first dialogue to be recited by Bhīma from *nepathya* before the exit of the Sūtradhāra, i. e., in the Prastāvanā.⁵ It thus appears that according to Abhinavagupta the plot begins from the first significant speech of one of the characters of the play concerned. Viśvanātha also follows Abhinavagupta and quotes the same verse as an illustration of the Upakṣepa.⁶ Sāgara seems to maintain that the plot begins from a clear hint to it by the Sūtradhāra in the Prastāvanā. This is evident from the above illustration of the Upakṣepa in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*. The verse concerned, along with the attached prose portion of Sūtradhāra's speech, expresses a pious wish, "Let there be a peace between the Pāṇḍavas and the Kauravas through the attempt of Kṛṣṇa," and thus indicates the beginning of the theme. Through *śleṣa* it also gives a hint to the destruction of the Kauravas, the ultimate object of the drama.⁷

2. Parikara : Sāgara quotes the definition of Parikara from the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and elucidates it by saying that Parikara is the amplification of the central theme which has already been started (in the Upakṣepa).⁸ As an illustration of the Parikara, the verse : *yusmacchāśana-laṅghanāmbhasi* etc., from the first act of the *Venī-saṃhāra* has been quoted where Bhīma hurls defiance at Yudhiṣṭhira before Sahadeva and expresses his resolve to destroy the Kauravas.⁹ The development of the main issue is apparent here.

3. Parinyāsa : Parinyāsa is the mention of the decision regarding the main issue, as stated by Sāgara following the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. The verse, *cañcad-bhuja-bhramita-caṇḍagadābhigḥāta*, etc., from the above drama has been taken to be the example of Parinyāsa by Abhinavagupta, Sāgara, Ramacandra-Guṇacandra and Viśvanātha.¹⁰ The verse expresses the decision of Bhīma that he would break the thighs of Duryodhana and would braid Draupadī's hair. Dhanika, however, quotes the verse as an example of Samādhāna.¹¹

Sāgara gives another definition of Parinyāsa according to which it consists in the utterance of the truth of the matter, necessitated due to the multiplication of issues.¹²

The *Daśa-rūpaka* defines the above three *aṅgas* of the Mukha-sandhi as the sowing of the seed, its amplification and the final decision regarding it, respectively and is followed by the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa*, *Bhāva-prakāśana*, *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* and the *Nāṭaka-candrikā*.¹³

4. Vilobhana : The description of the merits (*guṇanirvarnanam*) of the object of desire (*arthasya*) is Vilobhana.¹⁴ The verse : *manthāyastārṇavāmbh* etc., of Bhīma, describing the terrible beating of the war drums in the *Venī-saṃhāra* has been taken up as an illustration of Vilobhana by Sāgara.¹⁵ To Bhīma the immediate object of desire is undoubtedly the war which is indicated here by the beating of drums and the above verse describes its terrible sound. The illustration thus is a bit far-fetched.

The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* following *Abhinava-bhārati*, rightly cites the speech of Draupadī : *kiṃ nāha, dukkaram tve* etc., supporting the *gunavattva* of *duryodhanavadha*, referred to by

Bhīma in the verse : *cañcad-bhuja-bhramita* etc., in the same drama; as an illustration of Vilobhana.¹⁶ The *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* takes Vilobhana to mean a description of merits of the hero or the heroine.¹⁷

Abhinavagupta remarks that the above four *aṅgas* generally occur in the Mukha-sandhi and in the same order in which they have been enumerated.¹⁸ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* follows a different order in enumerating the *aṅgas* but maintains that Vilobhana occurs after Parinyāsa up to which it follows the order of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.¹⁹

5. *Yukti* : *Yukti* has been defined as the careful consideration of facts.²⁰ As an illustration of *Yukti*, Sāgara cites a verse which means that a mighty hero, though unarmed kills the enemy just as Viṣṇu slew Hiraṇyakaśipu.²¹ This seems to be the speech of some one arguing in favour of valour. *Yukti* according to Abhinavagupta, discloses what is to be unfolded.²²

6. *Prāpti* : Sāgara defines *Prāpti* as the reference to or mention of (*upagamana*) the central issue²³ (*mukhārtha*) and illustrates it with the verse,—‘*mathnāmi kauravaśataṃ samare*’ etc., from the *Venī-saṃhāra*.²⁴ In this verse Bhīma expresses his firm determination to disobey Yudhiṣṭhira in avenging of the wrongs done by the Kauravas and to kill them. The central issue, i. e., the destruction of the Kauravas has been mentioned here.

The *Nāṭya-śāstra* defines *Prāpti* as the approach of a pleasurable situation.²⁵ The *Daśa-rūpaka*, *Nāṭya-darpaṇa*, and the *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* follow this definition of the *Prāpti*.²⁶

7. *Samādhāna* : *Samādhāna* is the re-establishment of the purpose of the germ (*bījārthasyopagamanam*).²⁷ The concluding verse of the first act of the *Venī-saṃhāra* has been cited in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* as an illustration of *Samādhāna*.²⁸ Sāgara defines *Prāpti* as : *mukhārthasyopagamana* and *Samādhāna* as : *bījārthopagamana*. *Bījārtha* and *mukhārtha* practically indicate the samething. Thus one definition overlaps the other. Abhinavagupta points out that the *Bīja* in *Samādhāna* comes to be related to the main hero and is properly sown.²⁹

8. Vidhāna : A situation causing both joy and sorrow is Vidhāna.³⁰ Sāgara cites two examples of Vidhāna, one from the *Bālacarita* and the other from the *Venī-saṃhāra*.³¹ Viśvanātha also cites the same verse from the *Bālacarita* as the example of Vidhāna.³² The verse : *bhūyah-paribhāvāklānti-lajjā* etc., of Bhīma from the *Venī-saṃhāra*, cited by Sāgara as an example of Vidhāna, has also been quoted by Dhanika in the same context,³³ but, in the *Abhinava-bhārati* and *Nāṭya-darpaṇa*, the same has been taken to illustrate Udbheda.³⁴

9. Paribhāvanā : The incident or situation (*artha*) that provides for fresh curiosity (*kutūhalāntarādāyī*) is Paribhāvanā.³⁵ Abhinavagupta maintains that the agitation (*āvega*) mixed with curiosity is Paribhāvanā.³⁶ Sāgara illustrates this *aṅga* by citing from the *Venī-saṃhāra* Act. I, where Draupadī, on hearing the sudden beating of the war-drums becomes curious and asks its reason to Bhīma.³⁷ Abhinavagupta, Dhanika and Viśvanātha also cite the same situation to illustrate Paribhāvanā.³⁸

10. Udbheda : Udbheda has been defined as the sprouting of the Bīja.³⁹ Sāgara cites the slaying of Mārīca and others as an illustration of Udbheda as these activities of Rāma have been taken to be manifestation of the germ of the doom of Rāvaṇa.⁴⁰

11. Karaṇa : The *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* reads Kāraṇa, but all other works follow the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and read Karaṇa which has rightly been suggested by Dr Raghavan to be the correct reading.⁴¹ Karaṇa has been defined as the commencement of the action to accomplish the desired object (*praktārthaḥ samārambhaḥ*).⁴² The speech of Bhīma, "Let us proceed to destroy the race of Kuru, in the Act I of the *Venī-saṃhāra* has been cited by Sāgara, as an illustration of Karaṇa.⁴³ As an *aṅga* of the Mukha-sandhi, Karaṇa (*kāraṇa*) thus may be described as situation representing the first step towards the realisation of the purpose. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* records a view, said to be maintained by some, according to which Karaṇa is suppression of difficulties (*vipadāṃ śamanam*).⁴⁴

12. Bheda : Athorities differ regarding the exposition of this *āṅga*. Its definition in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* seems to mean that the situation disrupting the union of something, is Bheda.⁴⁵ Sāgara takes this definition of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* to mean that Bheda is the breaking up of affairs or purposes (*artha*), united through aggregation. Two Anuṣṭubhas have been cited to illustrate this *āṅga*.⁴⁶ These two verses refer to a situation where the confusion of Daśaratha as to how can Rāma, forceless and weaponless, be expected to kill Tāḍakā is represented as dissolved by Viśvāmitra's reply that it will be possible through his power.⁴⁷ From the illustration it appears that according to Sāgara Bheda is a situation which represents the solution of some problem by dissolving the factors creating it.

According to Abhinavagupta, Bheda is the situation meant for the exit of characters from the stage. He further points out that Bheda as means (*upāyātmā*) should be counted among Sandhyantaras.⁴⁸ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* defines Bheda (Bhedana) as the exit of characters and follows *Abhinavabhāratī* both in exposition and illustration.⁴⁹ According to the *Daśa-rūpaka*, as interpreted by Dhanika, Bheda is the encouragement of some factor fostering the germ.⁵⁰ The *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* follows Abhinavagupta.⁵¹ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* records another view according to which Bhedana (Bheda) is the move that removes the obstacles against the growth of the Bīja.⁵²

These are the twelve *āṅgas* of the first Sandhi. Dhanika maintains that among these, Upakṣepa, Parikara Parinyāsa, Yukti, Udbheda and Samādhāna are essential to the presentation of the Mukha-sandhi.⁵³ The use of the rest according to Dhanika, is thus discretionary.

ĀNGAS OF THE PRATIMUKHA-SANDHI

Sāgara enumerates the *āṅgas* of the Prati-mukha-sandhi after the *Nāṭya-śāstra* with slight deviations in naming of two *āṅgas* which will be noted in proper places. It is the

Nāṭya-darpaṇa that differs most from the *Nāṭya-śāstra* so far as the names of the *aṅgas* and their order are concerned. All other authorities mostly follow the *Nāṭya-śāstra* with bits of changes introduced here and there.

1. Vilāsa : Following the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, Sāgara defines Vilāsa as the longing or effort (*saṁhā*) for amorous pleasures. He offers another definition of Vilāsa as the enjoyment of amorous play.¹ The illustration is cited from the second Act of the drama *Jānakī-rāghava*, where Rāma expresses his delight on seeing the bashful and amorous movements of Sītā.² Abhinavagupta rightly limits this *aṅga* to the second Sandhi of those dramas where Śṛṅgāra is the dominant Rasa and criticises the ill-timed and ill-placed inclusion of it in the second Act of the *Veṇī-saṁhāra*, depicting Duryodhana's dalliance with Bhānumatī.³ Abhinavagupta, however, does not exclude this *aṅga* from the second Sandhi of dramas having Vīra as the dominant Rasa. He maintains that in these dramas Utsāha should take the place of Rati, as the word Rati in Bharata's definition here stands for the Sthāyi-bhāva.⁴ The point has been made clear in the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* where it is clearly stated that the Utsāha etc., expressed through the behaviour of man and woman is to be taken as Vilāsa in dramas with Vīra etc., as the main Rasa.⁵ Thus, according to this view the *aṅga* Vilāsa may also occur in dramas with a Rasa other than the Śṛṅgāra, as the main.

2. Parisarpa : Following the *Nāṭya-śāstra* Sāgara describes Parisarpa as the pursuing of what has been seen at first and is lost afterwards.⁶ The illustration, cited by Sāgara from the drama *Jānakī-rāghava*, depicts the situation where Rāma describes Sītā who spent many days when he, seen formerly was no longer in her sight, and now casts glances on some pretext without speaking to him.^{6a} The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* places it as the last *aṅga* of the second Sandhi and calls it as Anusarpa. In definition, however, the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* follows the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.⁷ The *Bhāva-Prakāśana* defines Parisarpa as the pursuing of the Bīja, seen before but lost sight of temporarily.⁸ This definition suits well

with the *dr̥ṣṭa-naṣṭa* characteristic of the Pratimukha-sandhi which has already been discussed in details.

3. Vidhūta : Vidhūta is the non-acceptance of a courtesy or request at the first instance.⁹ Abhinavagupta makes the definition of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* more clear and say that Vidhūta is non-acceptance of the request at the first instance and then acceptance of the same.¹⁰ Sāgara for illustration quotes the verse : *vikīra dhavaladīrghāpāṅga-samsarpi* etc., from the second Act (*Bhānumatyāṅka*) of the *Veṇī-saṃhāra* where Duryodhana's entreaties to Bhānumatī have been described.¹¹ The *Daśa-rūpaka* takes Vidhūta to mean *arati*.¹² Only *arati* cannot explain the situation taken as Vidhūta in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and this definition has been rejected in the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* on the ground that it overlaps the definition of Rodha (Nirodha).¹³

4. Tāpana : Tāpana has been defined in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* after the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, as the visualisation of a danger.¹⁴ As an illustration, the verse : *dullahajānāpurāo* etc., from the second Act (*Kadaligṛha*) of the *Ratnāvalī* has been quoted, where Sāgarikā pines for her love for a person beyond her reach and finds nothing but death as the last refuge.¹⁵ Abhinavagupta also quotes the same verse to illustrate Tāpana.¹⁶ Viśvanātha defines Tāpana as the non-availability of any means, but quotes the same verse as above for illustration.¹⁷ The *Daśa-rūpaka* reads Śama instead of Tāpana and defines it as the dispelling of the *arati* which is the characteristic of Vidhūta.¹⁸

5. Narma : While describing the *aṅgas* of the Kaiśikī-vṛtti, Sāgara defines Narma. Evidently, Narma the *aṅga* of the Pratimukha-sandhi, has been taken by Sāgara as identical with Narma, the *aṅga* of the Kaiśikī-vṛtti. There he gives the view of Ācārya, i.e., Bharata, according to which Narma consists mainly in the use of dialogues provoking laughter and promoting love (Śṛṅgāra).¹⁹ The *Nāṭya-śāstra* in the context of Sandhyaṅgas defines Narma as the laughter caused in sport.²⁰ According to the *Daśa-rūpaka* it is simply humorous speech²¹ and this definition has been taken up by Viśvanātha.²²

6. Narmadyuti : Narmadyuti, according to the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kōśa* is the laughter for the purpose of play and allurements.²³ For illustration Sāgara quotes from the second Act of the *Ratnāvalī* a passage where the Vidūṣaka on hearing the words of the *sārikā* says to the king that there is a ghost on the tree.²⁴ The *Nāṭya-śāstra*, however, defines Narmadyuti as the humorous speech used to cover one's own flaw and the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* also maintains the same view.²⁵ Rāmacandra and Guṇacandra restrict Narma and Narmadyuti in plays depicting love affairs where the Kaiśikī-ṛtti gets prominence.²⁶ Dhanañjaya takes this *aṅga* to mean the joy arising out of Narma and finds Viśvanātha as his follower.²⁷

7. Pragamana : The name of this *aṅga* has been variously read in different treatises. Abhinavagupta reads Pragayana and says that it is a *rūḍhi-śabda*. He, however, gives an elaborate etymology of the term following other's opinion and records another name Prāgayana.²⁸ The Daśa-rūpaka²⁹ reads Pragamana and this reading has been accepted by others.

The *Nāṭya-śāstra*, as followed by Sāgara, defines Pragamana simply as a series of questions and answers.³⁰ For illustration, a portion consisting of a series of questions and answers between Janaka and a *baṭu* (pupil) has been quoted from the second Act of the drama *Rāma-vikrama*.³¹ From this characteristic of the Pragamana, it appears that this *aṅga* may occur anywhere in a drama and has no special connection with any Sandhi. Dhanañjaya defines this *aṅga* as *uttarā vāk*, and Dhanika seems to interpret it as a repartee contributing to the progress of the main topic.³² The *Bhāva-prakāśana* defines it as *yuktottara* which means nothing more than a fit reply.³³

8. Virodha : Without any substantial difference in definition the name of the *aṅga* is read as Virodha in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kōśa*, *Sāhitya-darpaṇa*, *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* and *Nāṭaka-candrikā*; and Nirodha in the *Daśa-rūpaka* and *Bhāva-prakāśana*. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* reads Rodha while the *Nāṭya-śāstra* (GOS) reads Nirodha but one ms. reads

Virodha. Virodha is the appearance of some trouble (*vyasana-samprāpti*).³⁴ Sāgara cites illustration of this *aṅga* from the second Act of the *Jānakī-rāghava* where Sītā expresses her apprehension of troubles to Rāma for his enmity with Paraśurāma.³⁵ The *Daśa-rūpaka* defines it as *hitarodha* and the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* says that Rodha is *artī* and makes this definition clear when it says : *artih khedo vyasanam iṣṭarodhāḍ rodhaḥ*³⁶ i.e., Nirodha (Rodha) consists in the frustration due to the obstruction to the desired aim.

9. Paryupāsana : Paryupāsana is the propitiation of an angry person and has been illustrated by Sāgara with reference to the situation where Daśaratha tries to appease Bhārgava with conciliatory words.³⁷ Other authorities also agree with the definition of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, as followed by Sāgara. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa*, however, names this *aṅga* as *Sāntvana*.³⁸

10. Puṣpa : Puṣpa has been described as flowery speech (*viśeṣa-vacana*) in the *Nāṭya-śāstra*³⁹ and Sāgara explains the significance of *viśeṣa-vacana* as a speech describing the excellence of a particular action with reference to some other action.⁴⁰ The illustration, cited from the second Act of the *Jānakī-rāghava* is the speech of a character who consoles Sītā by describing the excellence of Rāma's prowess and his victory over Paraśurāma.⁴¹

Abhinavagupta says that the speech expressing the ardour of love is also Puṣpa.⁴² This is most suitable to the *Pratimukha-sandhi* of dramas depicting love intrigues. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* states that a statement becomes *viśeṣavat* when it says something over and above a former statement and it is Puṣpa (flower) as it enhances the beauty of the former statement like flower doing the same of the braid.⁴³

11. Vajra : The *aṅga* Vajra, consists in a harsh statement,⁴⁴ i.e., a shocking utterance. The illustration is cited from the *Puṁsavanāṅka* where Rāma is accused of not abandoning Sītā, taken away and kept so long by Rāvaṇa.⁴⁵

12. Upanyāsa : According to the *Nāṭya-śāstra* as accepted by both Abhinavagupta and Sāgara, Upanyāsa consists i

logical statement.⁴⁶ This *aṅga* has been illustrated by Sāgara by a citation from the second Act of the *Jānakī-rāghava* where Śātānanda, on hearing the reasoned speech of Daśaratha expresses his pleasure and supports it.⁴⁷ This definition has also been followed in the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa*.⁴⁸ But according to one ms. of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, Upanyāsa consists in a statement embodying some means (*upāya*) and the *Daśa-rūpaka* follows this definition.⁴⁹ It is interesting to note that the editor of the *Daśa-rūpaka* records a different definition according to which Upanyāsa is propitiation; Viśvānātha and Śāradātanaya follow this definition of the *aṅga*.⁵⁰ It is curious to note that Bhoja omits this *aṅga* of the Pratimukha-sandhi and says that this Sandhi has got twelve *aṅgas*⁵¹ instead of thirteen. Rāghava-bhaṭṭa spots out this *aṅga* in two places in his Arthadyotanikā in two different senses.⁵²

13. Varṇa-saṃhāra : The *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* records two definitions of this *aṅga*. According to the first one Varṇa-saṃhāra consists in concealing or repudiation of something which has already been exposed.⁵³ The illustration is cited from the incidents of the *Kadaligrha* in the Act. II. of the *Ratnāvalī* where the Vidūṣaka asks the king to win over the tattling Susaṅgatā by a reward, so that the secret, i.e., the picture incident, which has already been known to her, may be guarded.⁵⁴ Sāgara further informs us that according to some Varṇa-saṃhāra consists in the congregation of four castes.⁵⁵ The GOS. edition of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* gives this second definition of the Varṇa-saṃhāra but one ms. supports the first definition.⁵⁶ It is evident that Sāgara takes the first definition as authentic, the second one is introduced as the opinion of some. Abhinavagupta following his teacher, takes *cāturvarṇyopagamana* to mean the drawing together of the Varṇas i.e., the characters, dissociated for some reason and rejects the view that the congregation of four castes is Varṇasaṃhāra.⁵⁷ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* follows the *Abhinava-bhāratī* but refers to other two views found in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa* as opinions of some.⁵⁸ The *Daśa-rūpaka*, *Bhāva-prakāśana* and the *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* up-

hold the view maintaining the assemblage of different castes to be the *Varṇa-saṃhāra*.⁵⁹

Dhanika maintains that among the above thirteen *aṅgas* of the *Pratimukha-sandhi*, *Parisarpa*, *Prasama* (*Śama*), *Vajra*, *Upanyāsa* and *Puṣpa* are essential (*pradhāna*) and the others may be used whenever possible or necessary and this is also the view, upheld in the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa*.⁶⁰ Bhoja, as has been stated above, maintains that the *Pratimukha-sandhi* contains twelve *aṅgas*.

ĀNGAS OF THE GARBHA-SANDHI

1. *Abhūtodāharaṇa* : The *Nāṭya-śāstra* as well as other text books read the name of this *aṅga* as *Abhūtāharaṇa* instead of *Abhūtodāharaṇa* of the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* and *Asatyāharaṇa* of the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa*. All the theorists follow Bharata in defining this *aṅga* as consisting in a deceptive statement.¹ For illustration Sāgara refers to the passage from the Act called *Aśvatthāmā*, i.e., the Act. III of the *Veṇī-saṃhāra*, where the *Sūta* describes how *Yudhiṣṭhira* took resort to falsehood in announcing the death of *Aśvatthāman*.²

2. *Mārga* : All the theorists agree in describing *Mārga* as a statement of truth or of facts.³ This *aṅga* has been illustrated in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* with a passage from the Act. III of the *Jānakī-rāghava* where *Hanumān* describes the achievements of *Rāma* which are facts.⁴

3. *Rūpa* : Following the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, Sāgara defines *Rūpa* as a conjecture having a *citrārtha*.⁵ By *citrārtha* Sāgara seems to mean unusual or wonderful sense, as is evident from the illustration cited from the *Śaikeṭāṅka*, (the Act III of the *Ratnāvalī*) where the love-lorn king describes his own condition and says that it is really wonderful or unusual that *Kāma* pierces with all his arrows at a time the mind which is fickle by nature.⁶ The same illustration has been cited by Bhoja and *Viśvanātha*.⁷ But *Abhi-*

navagupta and Rāmacandra refer to the above situation to illustrate Udāharaṇa.⁸

Abhinavagupta interpretes the definition of Rūpa of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* as some inconclusive statement due to the diversity of facts and distinguishes this *aṅga* from the Yukti by saying that the latter contains a fixed conclusion which is wanting in the former.⁹ For illustration of Rūpa, Abhinavagupta cites from the Act II of the *Ratnāvalī* the verse,—*prasidetī brūyām idam asati* etc., forming a speech of the king which has been taken as an illustration of the Paryupāsana by Dhanika.¹⁰ The *Daśa-rupaka* omits the epithet *citra* and states that the Rūpa consists in a statement containing conjectures.¹¹ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* follows *Ahhiṇava-bhārati* but records the view held by Dhanañjaya, as the opinion of some and also refer to a view according to which Rūpa is a striking description, as is clear from the illustration cited from the *Veni-saṃhāra* (Act IV) where Sundaraka gives a vivid description of the battle-scene.¹²

4. Udāharaṇa : The *Nāṭya-śāstra* as accepted by Abhinavagupta defines Udāharaṇa as a statement expressing excellence of something.¹³ Sāgara does not differ very much from this in describing Udāharaṇa as an exaggerated statement.¹⁴ For illustration Sāgara refers to the verse : *yo yaḥ sastram bibharti* etc., from the *Veni-saṃhāra* (Act III) where Aśvathāman boastfully declares that he would kill all the heroes of the Pāṇḍava camp.¹⁵ The *Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa* and the *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* also cite the same illustration.¹⁶

5. Krama : The *Nāṭya-śāstra* as interpreted by Abhinavagupta; describes Krama as the knowing of the real state of affairs concerning something pondered over.¹⁷ Sāgara defines Krama as the knowledge of the events to come, *bhaviṣyat tattvopalabdhīḥ*.¹⁸ The illustration is cited from the Aśvatthāmāṅka (Act III of the *Veni-saṃhāra*) where Kṛpa asserts that given the supreme command, Aśvatthāman is able to destroy the whole world, not to speak of the Pāṇḍavas.¹⁹ But, strictly speaking this cannot be taken as *bhaviṣyattattva*, it is simply a bold assertion of Kṛpa regarding the future events which is never to materialise. It thus

appears that any bold assertion regarding a future event is Krama according to Sāgara. The view held by Sāgara with illustration has been recorded in the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* as the opinion of some.²⁰ Dhanañjaya describes Krama as the accomplishment of the desired end and this view has also been recorded in the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* as the opinion of some, while the *Bhāva-prakāśana* repeats it.²¹ The *Daśa-rūpaka* further says that according to some Krama consists in *bhāvajñānam*.²² This view is in conformity with that of Abhinavagupta and the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* upholds this view.²³ The *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* gives the definition of Krama from the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.²⁴

6. Saṃgraha : All the authorities agree in describing Saṃgraha as a statement introducing conciliation (*sāma*) or offer of some gift (*dāna*) or other expedients like *bheda* and *daṇḍa*.²⁵ Sāgara illustrates this *aṅga* with the conciliatory speech of Dhṛtarāṣṭra from the Act. V. of the *Veṇī-saṃhāra*.²⁶

7. Anumāna : Anumāna has been described as arriving at a logical conclusion through inference from something perceptible.²⁷ This *aṅga* has been illustrated in the *Nāṭya-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* with the second half of a verse, quoted from the *Jānaki-rāghava*, as informs the *Sāhitya-darpaṇa*. Herein the conclusion of one's being the son of the Sun has been drawn from one's lustrous body and prowess.²⁸

8. Prārthanā : Dhanañjaya, Śāradātanaya and Siṅga-bhūpāla do not take this *aṅga* into account and maintain that there are twelve *aṅgas* of the third Sandhi²⁹ instead of thirteen of Bharata as followed by Sāgara, Rāmacandra and Viśvanātha. The *māṭrkā bha* text of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* as informed by the editor of the GOS. text, does not contain the definition of Prārthanā.³⁰ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* also informs us : *kecit tu prākṛtanam idam caṅgam na manyante*.³¹ Prārthanā according to the *Nāṭya-śāstra* is a request for the enjoyment of love (*ratī*), rejoicing (*harṣa*) or festivity (*utsava*).³² But Sāgara describes this *aṅga* simply as a request and for illustration quotes from the *Sampātyañka* where Māyavati seems to try her wit on someone.³³

9. Utkṣipta : There are several variants so far as the name of this *aṅga* is concerned.³⁴ According to the *Nāṭya-śāstra* as interpreted by Abhinavagupta. Akṣipti consists in the bursting out of the secret (*garbhasyodbhedanam*), hidden in the heart.³⁵ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* defines the *aṅga* as the revealing of the Bīja but accepts the above view of Abhinavagupta as an alternative.³⁶ The *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* also follows *Abhinava-bhāratī*.³⁷ Sāgara describes Utkṣipti as the revealing out of the Bīja (*bijodbhedanam*).³⁸ For illustration a verse from the *Bālacarita*, an unidentified work, is quoted where it is said that Rāma promised the kingdom as a reward for the recovery of Sītā and slaying Vālin he had given it to Sugrīva.³⁹ Sāgara comments on this illustration that the accomplishment of the *garbhābīja* has been disclosed.⁴⁰ The accomplishment of the hidden Bīja here evidently refers to the recovery of Sītā. The *Daśa-rūpaka* also defines Ākṣepa as the disclosing of the *garbha-bīja*.⁴¹ From the above it appears that here the word *garbha* in the definition of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* has been taken by some to mean secret feeling while others take it in the sense of main purpose (*bīja*), remaining hidden and as a result we get almost three separate definition of this *aṅga*, disclosing of the hidden feeling, that of the main purpose and the same of the hidden main purpose. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* informs us that some authorities do not take this *aṅga* into account at all.⁴²

10. Totaka : Sāgara describes Totaka after the *Nāṭya-śāstra* as the speech full of *samrambha*⁴³ (excitement). For illustration a verse from the *Bālacarita* has been quoted where Rāvaṇa in excitement declares that his fire of anger will fall on the forest of enemies.⁴⁴ Here Rāvaṇa's agitation is due to anger. The point has been made clear by Abhinavagupta who says that a speech, pregnant with excitement (*āvega*) is Totaka, as it pierces the heart, and this excitement may be due to joy, anger or to some other reason.⁴⁵ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* also means the same.⁴⁶

11. Adhibala : The *Nāṭya-śāstra* as interpreted by Abhinavagupta, defines Adhibala as a situation where one is

overpowered by another through deceit, as is the case in the Act III of the *Ratnāvalī* where the king is deceived through the foolishness of the Vidūṣaka by Vāsavadattā in the guise of Sāgarikā.⁴⁷ The *Daśarūpaka*, *Nāṭya-darpaṇa*, *Bhāva-prakāśana* and *Sāhitya-darpaṇa*⁴⁸ follow Abhinavagupta. But one ms. of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* defines Adhibala as *kapaṭasyānyathābhāva*.⁴⁹ This definition has been accepted by Sāgara and Bhoja.⁵⁰ Adhibala, thus according to Sāgara and Bhoja consists in the baffling of an attempt of deception. The illustration is cited from the *Sampātyaṅka* where an attempt of the Rākṣasī Māyavati to dupe Aṅgada, Hanumān and others has been depicted as foiled.⁵¹ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* also refers to this view as the opinion of some.⁵² The *Daśa-rūpaka* informs us that in some works Adhibala is defined as : *toṭakasyānyathābhāva*.⁵³ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* records a view that describes it as, *sopālabham vākyaṃ*.⁵⁴

12. Udvega : Fear from the king, or the enemy, or the robber gives rise to the situation of Udvega according to the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.⁵⁵ Abhinavagupta maintains that here enemy (*ari*) includes even the heroine,⁵⁶ evidently in love intrigues. Dhanika also means the same when he illustrates the *aṅga* by referring to the situation where Sāgarikā is afraid of Vāsavadattā. But Dhanañjaya defines Udvega as : *arikṛtā bhītiḥ*.⁵⁷ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* follows Abhinavagupta and the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.⁵⁸

In the light of the above, the scope of Sāgara's definition of Udvega as, *nṛpatījanitabhayaṃ*⁵⁹ (fear from the king) is too small. The reading here in the text may be amended as, *nṛpādījanitabhayaṃ*. This reading finds support from a ms. of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, the *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* and the *Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa*.⁶⁰ As an illustration of Udvega, Sāgara quotes a verse from the *Sompātyaṅka* where Aṅgada being unable to find out Sītā thinks in despair what will he say to Rāma.⁶¹ The verse really depicts Aṅgada's anxiety (*udvega*) and not fear from the king.

13. Vidrava : Sāgara says that Vidrava (*agitation*, *panic*) is due to *śaṅkā*, *bhāya* and *trāsa*.⁶² A subtle difference in meanings of these three words has been brought

home to us by Sāgara when he illustrates Vidrava with a verse that depicts a situation where, on hearing terrible noise created by Khara etc., Rāma apprehended (*śaṅkā*) (some mischief), Sītā became afraid (*bhaya*) and the sages became panic-stricken (*trāsa*).⁶³ Thus, Vidrava according to Sāgara is a state of confusion arising out of apprehension, fear and panic and Viśvanātha also means the same.⁶⁴ For this exposition of Vidrava, Sāgara seems to be indebted to Śaṅkuka whose view has been reproduced in the *Abhinava-bhārati*.⁶⁵ Sāgara further says that according to some the Vidrava may arise from any one of the above three causes.⁶⁶ Abhinavagupta himself maintains that Vidrava is *śaṅkā* produced by *bhaya* and *trāsa*.⁶⁷ and this interpretation has been accepted by Bhoja and Rāmacandra-Guṇacandra.⁶⁸ The *Daśa-rūpaka* names the *aṅga* as Sambhrama and defines it as : *śaṅkā-trāsa*, and *Bhāva-prakāśana* simply reiterates this.⁶⁹

It is thus shown that Sāgara follows the *Nāṭya-sāstra* in enumerating the above thirteen *aṅgas* of the Garbhāsandhi. It has already been pointed out that Dhanañjaya, Śāradātanaya and Śiṅgabhūpāla omit Prārthanā and maintain that the third Sandhi has got twelve *aṅgas*. The view has been recorded in the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* as shown above. Viśvanātha also refers to the view.⁷⁰ Among these *aṅgas* Abhūtāharaṇa, Mārga, Toṭaka, Adhibala and Ākṣepa are main according to Dhanika and Rāmacandra-Guṇacandra.⁷¹

ĀNGAS OF THE VIMARŚA-SANDHI

1. Apavāda : Apavāda is censure and all the authorities beginning from Bharata define it as the declaration of fault.¹ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa*, however, makes the point more clear and says that Apavāda is *parivāda* which means, *sva-para-doṣodghaṭtanam*.² The illustration in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kōśa* is taken from the Act *Māyā-lakṣa-(kṣma)-ṇa* of the drama *Jānaki-rāghava*. The verse quoted for the purpose

gives a list of wrongs committed by Rāvaṇa and declares that the terrible consequence of these is sure to come.³

2. *Sampheta* : *Sampheta* is an exchange of angry speeches.⁴ Sāgara offers two illustrations of this *aṅga* ; one from the *Veni-saṃhāra* (Act. VI) where Yudhiṣṭhira and Cārvāka engage in altercation regarding the duel between Bhīma and Duryodhana, and the other is from the *Samketāṅka*, i.e., the Act III of the *Ratnāvalī* where Vāsavadattā chastises the king.⁵ Abhinavagupta informs that some name the *aṅga* as *Samphoṭa*, taking the root *sphoṭa* to mean *anādara*.⁶

3. *Drava* : The *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* defines *Drava* after the *Nāṭya-sāstra* as *guruvyatikrama*⁷ and distinguishes it from *Vidrava* of the *Garbha-sandhi* by stating ; *śaṅkādhirmanasaḥ kṣobho vidravaḥ sa eva paribhava-kṛto dravaḥ*.⁸ Thus, according to Sāgara both *Vidrava* and *Drava* signify mental agitation, the difference lies in the cause of that agitation. In the case of *Vidrava*, it is caused by *śaṅkā* etc., while in case of *Drava*, it is caused by *paribhava* (humiliation). The illustration is cited from the Act VI of the *Veni-saṃhāra* where Yudhiṣṭhira expresses his mental agitation before Draupadī by referring to the great humiliation they suffered at the hands of the Kāuravas even before the superiors and kinsmen, the only remedy for which is their own death or that of Duryodhana.⁹ Abhinavagupta, however, takes the expression *guruvyatikrama* in the sense of disrespect or insolence towards the superiors.¹⁰ Dhanañjaya, Rāmacandra-Guṇacandra and Bhoja also define *Drava* as consisting in showing of disrespect to the superiors,¹¹ to this Viśvanātha adds the reason *śokāvegādisambhava*.¹² According to this view, *Drava* is the showing of disrespect to the superiors by some one out of grief, mental agitation etc.

It may be noted here that the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* admits of two *Dravas*, one in the *Garbha-sandhi* and the other in the *Vimarśa-sandhi*. The first is the *Vidrava* of the *Nāṭya-sāstra* and *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*.

4. *Śakti* : Almost all the theorists follow the *Nāṭya-sāstra* in defining *Śakti* as the putting down of an antagonism : *virodhapraśama*¹³ Abhinavagupta, evidently with love-

dramas in his mind, interpret the definition of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* as placating one who is angry.¹⁴ Sāgara picks up the illustration from the *Cūḍāmaṇi-saṃhāra* (Act. V. of the *Nāgānanda*) where Garuḍa at the advice of the hero promises not to kill any living being in future.¹⁵ The situation referred to in the illustration may be taken to depict the putting down of the *virodha* of Garuḍa with the Nāgas. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* defines Śakti following the above explanation of Abhinavagupta as *kruddha-prasādanam*, but extends its scope and says that Śakti consists also in the total annihilation of the angry enemy.¹⁶ It also informs us that some theorists omit Śakti and admit a new *aṅga* Bhāvāntara, while some others place Ājñā in the place of Śakti. Bhāvāntara is said to be the existence of contrary intentions and Ājñā consists in giving an order without considering the propriety.¹⁷

5. Vyavasāya : Vyavasāya has been defined in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kosa* as a statement connected with the *pratijñā-hetu*.¹⁸ The expression *pratijñā-hetu* has not been explained by Sāgara. For illustration Sāgara quotes a portion of a speech from the *Veṇi-saṃhāra* (Act. VI) where Pāñcalaka describes the finding out of Duryodhana by Bhīma and refers to the statement of Vāsudeva that Duryodhana knows the art of mastery over water (*jalas-tambhana*).¹⁹ From this illustration it appears that *pratijñā-hetu* has been understood by Sāgara to mean the means for the fulfilment of the resolved end. Here the finding of Duryodhana is the resolved end of Bhīma, who secures the means from the above statement of Vāsudeva. The definition of Vyavasāya in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* has been explained by Abhinavagupta also in the sense of acquisition of means for the accomplishment of undertakings.²⁰ The *Daśa-rūpaka* defines this *aṅga* as the declaration of ones own power, i.e., boasting.²¹ The *Bhāva-prakāśana* and the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* follow this view, and the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* refers to it as the opinion of some.²²

5. Prasaṅga : Prasaṅga according to Sāgara is the declaration of something which is not the chief subject-

matter :²³ i.e., irrelevant. The mourning of Yudhiṣṭhira on hearing the false news of Bhīma's defeat and death from Cārvāka in the *Veṇī-saṃhāra* (Act. VI) has been cited as an illustration of Prasaṅga.²⁴ Here lamentation over Bhīma's death is entirely irrelevant as the fact is otherwise than the defeat of Bhīma. This definition of Prasaṅga, though supported by one of the manuscripts of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*²⁵ differs from that accepted by Abhinavagupta, but is followed by the *Bhāva-prakāśana* and is referred to in the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* as maintained by some.²⁶

The definition of Prasaṅga in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* as accepted by Abhinavagupta and followed by Dhanañjaya, Rāmacandra and Viśvanātha, means that the *aṅga* consists in the statement where superiors are respectfully referred to.²⁷

7. Dyuti : The *Nāṭya-śāstra* defines Dyuti as a contemptuous speech, *vākyamādhārṣa-samyuktam*.²⁸ Sāgara adds two more adjectives, viz., threatening (*tarjanā*) and insulting (*adhiḥśepa*) to the speech and concludes that an address (*āhūti*) with a harsh effect (*durukṭi pariṇāmā*) is meant here.²⁹ The challenging rebukes and harsh addresses hurled to Duryodhana hidden under water by Bhīma, as reported to Yudhiṣṭhira by Pāṇcālaka in the *Veṇī-saṃhāra* have been referred to as forming an illustration of Dyuti by Sāgara.³⁰ The same situation has been referred to for illustration of Dyuti in the *Daśa-rūpaka* and *Sāhitya-darpaṇa*, while defining the *aṅga* as consisting in a threatening and intimidating speech.³¹ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* takes this *aṅga* to be simple *tiraskāra* and refers to all the above views as those of others.³²

8. Kheda : Theorists like Dhanañjaya, Śāradātanaya, and Śiṅgabhūpāla do not count kheda as an *aṅga*. The reason perhaps is, as indicated by Abhinavagupta, that *śrama* a Vyabhicāribhāva cannot be included in the list of Sandhyaṅgas. Abhinavagupta, himself, however, maintains that *śrama*, *udvega*, *vitarka* etc., though included in the list of Vyabhicārin, may also be used as Sandhyaṅgas if there is scope.³³ The *Nāṭya-śāstra* followed by the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*, *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* and *Sāhitya-darpaṇa*, defines Kheda as

exhaustion (*śrama*) due to mental and physical over-working.³⁴ For illustration Sāgara quotes a verse from the *Jānakī-rāghava* (Act VI) where Rāma visualises Sītā's weariness.³⁵

9. Pratiṣedha : The *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* and the *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* follow the *Nāṭya-śāstra* in taking Pratiṣedha into account as an *aṅga*. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* also seems to admit this *aṅga* but terms it as Virodha.³⁶ Pratiṣedha has been defined as the obstruction to the (achievement of the) desired object.³⁷ Sāgara, for illustration, refers to the situation where Śaṅkhacūḍa describes his frustration in offering his body to Garuḍa, due to Jīmūtvāhana's intervention in the Act V of the *Nāgānanda*.³⁸

10. Virodhana : In complete agreement with the *Nāṭya-śāstra* Sāgara defines Virodhana as the appearance of delay or lapse (*atyaya*) to the *kārya*, i.e., the accomplishment of one's own desire (*kāryātyayopagamanam*).³⁹ Bhoja and Viśvanātha also maintain this view.⁴⁰ As an illustration of this *aṅga* Sāgara refers to the situation in the Act VI of the *Venī-saṃhāra*, where the Kañcukin mistakes Bhīma as Duryodhana, evidently out of fear, and declares that the latter after killing the former is coming here and is seeking Pāñcālī here and there.⁴¹ The Virodha of the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa*, as identified with Pratiṣedha above, also comes very near to this *aṅga*.

There is a confusion among the theorists regarding the exact significance of this *aṅga*. The *Daśa-rūpaka*, defines it as *saṃrabdhānām virodhanam* and Dhanika cites the angry exchange of hot words between Bhīma and Duryodhana from the *Venī-saṃhāra* (Act V) as an illustration.⁴² The *Bhāva-prakāśana* gives two similar definitions of Virodhana.⁴³ The *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* defines the *aṅga* as, *virodhanam nirodhoktiḥ śabdānām ca parasparam*.⁴⁴ Several mss. of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* also define Virodhana in the similar words.⁴⁵ It thus appears that from an early time there have been two distinct views regarding the nature of Virodhana, one taking it in the sense represented by Sāgara, Abhinavagupta, Bhoja and Viśvanātha and the other supporting the explanation offered by Dhanañjaya, Śāradātanaya etc.

11. *Ādāna* : Sāgara quotes the definition of *Ādāna* from the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.⁴⁶ According to this definition *Ādāna* signifies a situation that shows the nearness of the object indicated by the *Bīja*. It shows that the final fruition of the *Bīja* is drawing near. Sāgara illustrates this *aṅga* from the Act IV of the *Ratnāvalī* by citing the speech of *Vāsa-vadattā* who on seeing the conflagration request the king to save *Sāgarikā* kept bound, and the king readily accepts.⁴⁷ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* also defines *Ādāna* as ; *phala-sāmīpyam*.⁴⁸ Another school of thought represented by the *Daśa-rūpaka*, *Bhāva-prakāśana*, *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* etc., define *Ādāna* as a recapitulation of the action.⁴⁹

12. *Sādāna* : The term *Sādāna* as an *aṅga* of the fourth Sandhi is found only in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*. The *Nāṭya-śāstra* followed by the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa*, and the *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* names the *aṅga* as *Chādāna* while the *Daśa-rūpaka*, *Bhāva-prakāśana*, *Rasārṇava-sudhākara*, read *Chalana*. Sāgara describes this *aṅga* as an insulting speech, *apamānakṛtaṃ vākyaṃ*, while the *Nāṭya-śāstra* enjoins that insulting speech is to serve a purpose (*kāryārtham*).⁵⁰ The illustration, cited by Sāgara is from the Act. VI of the *Veṇīsaṃhāra* where *Bhīma* after his final triumph returns and from behind the screen asks for the whereabouts of *Draupadī* and refers to the insults she had to suffer in the past.⁵¹ Here the speech of *Bhīma* cannot be taken to be an insulting one though it refers to the past humiliations of *Draupadī*. *Abhinavagupta* makes the point clear and justifies the name *Chādāna* as it covers the insult.⁵² Sāgara's illustration may also be taken in this sense. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* follows *Abhinava-bhārati* and defines *Chādāna* as *manyumārjana*.⁵³

The *Daśa-rūpaka* and the *Bhāva-prakāśana* understand *Chalana* simply as insult and the view is recorded in the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa*.⁵⁴ Similarly the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* defines *Chalana* as : *avamānādikaraṇaṃ kōryāntam*.⁵⁵ *Viśvanātha*, following the *Nāṭya-śāstra* defines *Chālana* as the suffering

of an insult or the like for the sake of a purpose.⁵⁶ The *Kāvyamālā* edition of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* records a manuscript reading according to which Chalana is *sammoha* due to an insult or a similar discomfiture.⁵⁷ It is interesting to note that the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* records both the views as opinions of some.⁵⁸ That there were divergent views regarding the implication of this Sandhyaṅga is evident from the above.

13. *Prarocanā* : Sāgara defines *Prarocanā* as a situation that shows the *saṃhatārtha*,⁵⁹ but what is exactly meant by *saṃhatārtha* is not clear. For illustration Sāgara refers to a verse in the Act VI of the *Jānakī-rāghava*⁶⁰ where Lakṣmaṇa appears to console Rāma and says that more formidable and young enemies like Kumbhakarna, Indrajit and Kumbha have already been killed and it is the old Rāvaṇa who remains. This verse foresees the final victory of Rāma, i.e., the consistency of the final accomplishment is shown here. *Samhatārtha* in the definition may thus be taken to mean consistent or coherent purpose to be served. *Prarocanā* may thus be taken to signify a situation that fore-shows the final end of the play. The *Nāṭya-śāstra* defines *Prarocanā* as *saṃhārārtha-pradarśinī* which has been explained by Abhinavagupta as, *nirvāhyamānasyārthasya darśikā*.⁶¹ Thus according to Abhinavagupta also, *Prarocanā* means a situation that shows the desired end which is going to be accomplished. The final accomplishment, however, is represented in the last Sandhi. Bhoja and Viśvanātha also give the above definition of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.⁶² The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* defines *Prarocanā* as *bhāvasiddhiḥ* but follows *Abhinava-bhārati* in its commentary.⁶³ The definition of the *Daśa-rūpaka* which seems to be followed by the *Bhāva-prakāśana* and the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara*⁶⁴ do not differ in sense from that of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* as interpreted by Abhinavagupta.

Besides the thirteen *aṅga* discussed above, the GOS. edition of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* gives names and definitions of three other *aṅgas* of the *Vimarśa-sandhi* which are not commented upon by Abhinavagupta. They are,—*Vyāhāra*, *Yukti* and *Vicalana* which are defined respectively as, *pra-*

tyakṣa-vacanam, *saṁjchedaṁ vacaḥ* and *avamānārtha-saṁyuta*.⁶⁵ On the other hand Dhanañjaya omits Kheda and Pratiśedha of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and admits two new *aṅgas*, Vidrava and Vicalana defined as, *vadha-bandhādi* and *vīkatthanā* respectively.⁶⁶ Śāradātanaya, Śīṅabhūpāla and Rūpaḥsvāmin follow the *Daśa-rūpaka* in this respect.⁶⁷ All these simply show that the confusion regarding the number and definition of the Sandhyaṅgas is very old. Abhinavagupta himself informs us that some authorities omit any of the above thirteen *aṅgas*,⁶⁸ and maintain that the fourth Sandhi consists of only twelve *aṅgas*.⁶⁹ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* also records this view.

Dhanika maintains that among the thirteen *aṅgas* of the Vimarśa-sandhi, Apavāda, Śakti, Vyavasāya, Prarocanā and Ādāna are important.⁷⁰ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* omits Apavāda from this list.⁷¹

ANGAS OF THE NIRVAHANA-SANDHI

Artha : Artha as a name of an *aṅga* of the last Sandhi occurs only in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* where it is defined as an allusion to the main theme.¹ In this sense it is not different from the Sandhi of all other authorities including Bharata. Sandhi has been defined in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* as the coming up of the Bīja sown in this Mukha-sandhi.² *Pradhānārtha* of Sāgara may be taken to mean the Bīja of Bharata's definition. The definitions offered by other authorities do not differ in sense from that of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.³ The illustration cited by Sāgara is said to be taken from the *Māriṇa-vāṇīśataka*.⁴ Here Lakṣmaṇa requests Rāma to enter Laṅkā and accept the hospitality of the citizens. The killing of Rāvaṇa and the recovery of Sītā appear to constitute the *pradhānārtha* of the play which has been indirectly hinted at in the portion, cited as illustration.

2. Grathana : Grathana according to the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, as followed by Sāgara, Viśvanātha and Bhoja, is a reference

different purposes.⁵ All other authorities define Grathana as a reference to the *kārya*, evidently the main one represented to be served in the play (and not *kāryas* as taken in the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kōśa* ect.).⁶ Even Abhinavagupta and Viśvanātha in their notes on illustrations cited, remark *kāryasyopakṣepād*,⁷ meaning thereby that the *aṅga* consists in a reference to the *kārya*. Sāgara, on the other hand, for illustration cites a verse from the *Samhāra* (last Act) of the *Jānaki-rāghava*, where Lakṣmaṇa refers to several purposes shown as served in the drama, which are, killing of Khara, Dūṣaṇa etc., removal of the obstacles of penance, the death of Rāvaṇa the enemy of Indra and the installation of Vibhīṣaṇa on the throne.⁸ In the concluding paragraph of our discussion on the Avasthās, it has been pointed out that Indian dramatists always favour a mono-centric plot. In the light of the above the validity of the reading *kāryāṇām* as well as Sāgara's exposition become questionable. From the standpoint of Sāgara it may be said that the *kārya* (main purpose) is *ānusāṅgika-sampanna*⁹ i.e., the term *kārya* is to be taken to mean the main purpose along with the subsidiary ones. The point has already been elaborately discussed.¹⁰ Thus, there is no harm in taking Grathana to signify the recapitulation of *kāryas*. Moreover, the accomplishment of the main purpose (*phala*) is always associated with the serving of different subsidiary but connected purposes. So, a reference to the main purpose (*kārya*) imply the same to subsidiary ones. In the illustration cited by Sāgara, the killing of Rāvaṇa is the main purpose and others are subsidiary ones.

3. Nirṇaya : Nirṇaya is the narration of past experiences.¹¹ For illustration both Abhinavagupta and Sāgara refer to the situation in the Act IV of the *Ratnāvalī* where Vasubhūti and Sāgarikā come to recognise each other and the identity of the latter is disclosed.¹²

4. Paribhāṣaṇa : Paribhāṣaṇa has been described in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* as dialogues containing censure¹³ and the *aṅga* is accepted in this sense by Sāgara, Viśvanātha, Rāmacandra and Bhoja.¹⁴ Abhinavagupta and following him Rāmacandra

Guṇacandra, however, restrict this censuring to one's own self only.¹⁵ For illustration Sāgara refers to the situation in the *Veni-sambhāra* (Act IV) where Bhīma censures Duryodhana and Duḥśāsana, and begs Yudhiṣṭhira for leave to tie up the braid of Draupadī with his hands, tinged with the blood of the chief enemy.¹⁶ Bhoja also refers to the same situation for illustration.¹⁷ Dhanañjaya understands this *aṅga* as mutual conversation simply¹⁸ and the view has been referred to in the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* as the opinion of some.¹⁹ The *Bhāva-prakāśana* accepts both the above views.²⁰

5. Dyuti (Kṛti) : Dyuti according to Sāgara is the removal of the torment produced by jealousy or that of the jealous and torment.²¹ Bhoja defines this *aṅga* as the removal of jealousy and anger and a manuscript of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* supports this definition.²² The sense of the illustration, a single sentence, cited by Sāgara from the *Kāmadattāpūrti*²³ is not clear. Sāgara's view on this *aṅga*, however, has been referred to in the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa*, as the opinion of some.²⁴ The *Nāṭya-śāstra* as interpreted by Abhinava, defines Dyuti as the appeasement of anger etc.²⁵ Excepting the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* and *Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa*, all other works read the name of the *aṅga* as Kṛti. A manuscript of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* also uses the term Kṛti instead of Dyuti.²⁶ The *Daśa-rūpaka* defines Kṛti as *labdhārthaśamanam*,²⁷ i.e., peace due to the attainment. Kṛti may also imply the confirmation of the thing attained, as it appears from the *Avaloka*.²⁸ The *Bhāva-prakāśana* also gives these two implications of Kṛti.²⁹ The *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* quotes the definition of Kṛti from the *Daśa-rūpaka* and illustration from the *Avaloka* verbatim.³⁰ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* gives a quite new definition of the *aṅga* as *kṛtiḥ kṣemam*, i.e., the maintenance of the result attained.³¹ This definition does not differ in sense from that of the *Daśa-rūpaka* as interpreted by Dhanika. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* further informs us that some substitute Dyuti for Kṛti and define it as, *prāptasya pratikulyaśamanam*.³²

6. Prasāda : According to the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, as followed by Abhinavagupta, Sāgara and Bhoja ; Prasāda consists in

a propitiatory speech or situation.³³ Both Abhinavagupta and Sāgara cite the same speech of Vāsavadattā for illustration from the *Ratnāvalī* (Act IV) where she propitiates Sāgarikā and dresses her with ornaments.³⁴ Abhinavagupta informs that some read this *aṅga* just after Dyuti,³⁵ as is actually done in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa*. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* names an *aṅga* Upāsti and defines it as *sevā* which is *parā-prasattiheturvyāpāraḥ*, but informs us that some recognise Prasāda instead of Upāsti.³⁶ Thus, some sort of propitiation is the main element of Prasāda and this is the opinion of all other theorists.³⁷

7. Ānanda : All the theorists agree with Bharata in defining Ānanda as the attainment of the desired object.³⁸ Abhinavagupta very aptly remarks that the name is Ānanda as it gives joy.³⁹ Abhinavagupta and Sāgara cite the same illustration from the *Ratnāvalī* (Act IV) where the king gladly accepts the offer of Vāsavadattā, i.e., the hand of Sāgarikā.⁴⁰

8. Samaya : Samaya has been taken in the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, *Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa*, *Daśa-rūpaka*, *Nāṭya-darpaṇa*, *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* etc., as the disappearance of misery.⁴¹ But Sāgara defines it as the end of opposition, *virodha-śamanam*, and illustrates it by quoting from the Act IV. of the *Ratnāvalī* the speech of Vāsavadattā where she herself presents Sāgarikā to the king and requests to treat her affectionately.⁴² Thus by *virodha śamanam*, Sāgara also means a situation which depicts the disappearance of troubles for principal characters.

9. Anuyoga : The term Anuyoga denoting a Sandhyaṅga is used only in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kosa* where it is defined as the searching for the right object.⁴³ For illustration Sāgara cites a speech from the *Samhārāṅka* (last Act) of the *Jānakī-rāghava*, where Rāma eagerly asks Vibhīṣaṇa whether it is a fact that Sītā is unburnt, as he himself fails to see clearly due to the overflow of tears of joy.⁴⁴ That Sītā is safe and that the reunion which is the final end (*kārya*) of the drama is approaching, may be taken as the *yukta-kārya* here and Rāma is seeking that. From the

above exposition it appears that Anuyoga of Sāgara is the Nirodha of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and *Nāṭya-darpaṇa*, while it is termed as Virodha in the *Bhāva-prakāśana* and Vibodha in the *Daśa-rūpaka* and *Sāhitya-darpaṇa*. The *Nāṭya-śāstra*, as interpreted by Abhinavagupta, defines Nirodha as the search for the final object of desire through reason.⁴⁵ The same has been said about Nirodha in the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* in different words.⁴⁶ The *Daśa-rūpaka* omits *yuktyā* from the definition of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and says Vivodha is, *kāryamārgaṇam*; this definition seems to be followed by other theorists.⁴⁷

10. Upagūhana : (*Nāṭya-darpaṇa* Parigūhana, *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* Upagūḍha). All the theorists follow Bharata in defining Upagūhana as the occurrence of something marvellous or wonderful.⁴⁸ This is considered to be an important characteristic of the concluding portion of a drama and the point has already been elaborately discussed in connection with the Nirvahaṇa-sandhi. Sāgara illustrates this *aṅga*⁴⁹ by referring to the concluding portion of the *Veṇī-saṃhāra* where Kṛṣṇa describes how a marvellous situation is going to be created as all sages, generals, princes of different dynasties and even Vyāsa, Vālmīki and Paraśurāma themselves are coming to celebrate the coronation of Yudhiṣṭhira.

11. Bhāṣaṇa : According to Sāgara, Bhāṣaṇa is a statement of conciliation etc.⁵⁰ The *Nāṭya-śāstra* also means the same when it says that Bhāṣaṇa is the statement accompanied by conciliation or gifts or the like.⁵¹ Other theorists also understand this *aṅga* as acquisition of honour, or conciliatory statement or praise.⁵² Both Abhinavagupta and Sāgara, for illustration refer to the same situation from the *Ratnāvalī* (Act IV) where Vasubhūti praises Vāsava-dattā, as she herself gives Sāgarikā to the king.⁵³ Abhinavagupta rightly points out that Saṃgraha of the Garbhā-sandhi also bears the same characteristics as Bhāṣaṇa and maintains that as the latter is compulsory in the Nirvahaṇa sandhi, it is enumerated here.⁵⁴ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* also maintains that the use of this *aṅga* is compulsory in the last Sandhi.⁵⁵

12. *Pūrvavākya* : The definition of the *Pūrvavākya*, as given in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and commented upon by Abhinavagupta, signifies that this *aṅga* consists in the disclosure of the main purpose, proposed (evidently in the *Mukha-sandhi*) to be served.⁵⁶ Sāgara also seems to mean the same when he says that *Pūrvavākya* is the disclosure of the *Bīja*.⁵⁷ As an illustration Sāgara cites the speech of Bhīma from the *Venī-saṃhāra* (Act VI) where he says to the maid "Where is Bhānumatī? Now let her insult the wife of the Pāṇḍavas."⁵⁸ The reference is directly to the insult of Draupadī by Bhānumatī, reported to Bhīma by the maid in the *Mukha-sandhi*. This gives rise to a confusion as to the suitability of the illustration as the above does not contain any reference to the *Bīja*.⁵⁹ But the speech of Bhīma really refers in a covert way to the total annihilation of the Kauravas and the victory of the Pāṇḍavas which is the *Phala* of the drama. Moreover the prose portion quoted by Sāgara is a part of the whole speech of Bhīma and is immediately preceded by a verse (*kṛṣṭā yenāsi etc.*) where the killing of both Duryodhana and Duṣṣāsana has been referred to.

The *Daśa-rūpaka* defines the *aṅga* as the sight of the *Kārya* and in this respect is followed by the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* and the *Bhāva-prakāśana*.⁶⁰ The *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* follows the definition of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.⁶¹ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* further informs that some authorities understand *Pūrvavākya* as a statement similar to that made in the *Mukha-sandhi*, etc.⁶²

13. *Kāvya-saṃhāra* : Sāgara defines *Kāvya-saṃhāra* in the words of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* as the granting of the boon and obtaining of the desired end.⁶³ The definition of other authorities also do not differ in sense from that of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.⁶⁴ For illustration Sāgara refers to the verse *Krodhāndhaiḥ sakalam etc.*, from the concluding portion of the *Venī-saṃhāra* where Yudhiṣṭhira says that he has already obtained all the desired ends in reply to Vāsudeva's question, "What more do you wish".⁶⁵ It is a convention that towards the conclusion of a Sanskrit play some senior or noble character or the main helper of the hero, as the case may be, asks the hero a question like, *kim*

te bhuyaṃ priyam uśakaromi. The hero in reply expresses his full satisfaction and in many cases gives a list of attainments. This portion of the play is designated as Kāvya-saṃhāra and marks the termination of the dramatic business of a play and also is invariably followed by the Praśasti.

14. Praśasti: Sāgara following the *Nāṭya-śāstra* says that Praśasti is the end of the play and consists of a prayer for the welfare of the king, the Brāhmaṇas and cows etc.⁶⁶ For illustration, the concluding verse from the Rāghava-bhūdāya is quoted.⁶⁷ This is the conventional ending of a Sanskrit play and as a Sandhyaṅga, Praśasti should be used compulsorily. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* enjoins that Kāvya-saṃhāra and Praśasti are compulsory *aṅgas* and the latter also forms a part of the play.⁶⁸ Praśasti is always written in verse.

The above fourteen *aṅgas* of the last Sandhi are generally held to be equally important.⁶⁹ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* rightly restricts the use of Sandhi, Niroda, Grathana, Pūrvabhāva, Kāvya-saṃhāra and Praśasti in the Nirvahaṇa-sandhi only.⁷⁰

The Kāvya-saṃhāra is generally found to be concluded with such speech of the hero as : *ataḥ param api priyam aṣṭi*, and then in many cases a list of his achievements also is found to be put in his mouth. In many printed texts of Sanskrit plays the term Bharata-vākya is found to be prefixed to be benedictory verse (Praśasti) just after the *aṅga* Kāvya-saṃhāra. In some cases the term is found to be appended to the introductory speech itself of the Praśasti as : *tathāpīdam astu bharata-vākyaṃ*.⁷¹ The term in such cases is included in the speech.⁷² This particular term has given rise to a confusion. Now-a-days the Praśasti verse itself is known to be the Bharata-vākya. The most interesting point is this that the term Bharata-vākyaṃ is not found in any of the renowned works on dramaturgy like the *Nāṭya-śāstra* with *Abhinava-bhāratī*, *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kaśa*, *Daśa-rūpaka*, *Bhāva-prakāśana*, *Rasāraṇava-sudhākara*, *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* etc. Rāghava-bhaṭṭa seems to observe that the Praśasti is meant for the recitation by a member of the dramatic troupe.⁷³

(Bharata i.e. Naṭa) and as such, it is called Bharata-vākya. The Praśasti, the last and obligatory Sandhyaṅga cannot be taken to be recited by any character of the play concerned. Technically the play ends with the Kāvya-saṃhāra after which none of the participants in acting can be regarded as a character of the play, and the Praśasti is recited by a Naṭa or Naṭas (Bharata) on behalf of the troupe. Śivarāma in his commentary on the *Nāgānanda* says that the Praśasti itself is Bharata-vākya and the Naṭa is to recite this as there is no scope for any character to do the same after the play is over. Dr. K. K. Datta Shastri thus rightly suggests that the Bharata-vākya prefixed to the Praśasti-verse is simply a stage-direction. It is neither an *aṅga* of the last Sandhi nor can it be appended to the last speech as done by some editors.

NUMBER, NAME AND DEFINITIONS OF THE SANDHYANGAS

There has been a long standing confusion regarding the number, name and definitions of the Sandhyaṅgas. Like all other theorists Sāgara maintains that the number of the Sandhyaṅgas is sixtyfour,¹ but following the *Nāṭya-śāstra* he himself has described sixtyfive Sandhyaṅgas. Abhinavagupta, the great commentator of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, also does the same.³ The *Nāṭya-śāstra*, as it has come down to us, cannot help much in the matter. It distinctly says that the number of the Sandhyaṅgas is sixtyfour,³ but enumerates and defines sixtyfive of them. It has also been shown above that three extra *aṅgas* of the Vimarsa-sandhi have been recognised and defined in the GOS. text of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* but Abhinavagupta omits them.⁴

There is no controversy regarding the number of *aṅgas* of the first, second⁵ and the last Sandhis. Abhinavagupta seems to be in favour of accepting twelve *aṅgas* of the fourth Sandhi,⁶ though the view in another place has been referred to as maintained by some in the *Abhinava-bhāratī* itself.⁷ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* records a view that admits twelve *aṅgas*

of each of the third and fourth Sandhi.⁸ Broadly speaking there are two views regarding the number of the *aṅgas* of the third Sandhi. The *Daśa-rūpaka*, followed by the *Bhāva-prakāśana*, *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* and the *Nāṭaka-candrikā* assigns twelve *aṅgas* to this Sandhi, while in the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, as interpreted by Abhinavagupta and Sāgara, the number is thirteen. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* and the *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* follow this view. Besides the *Abhinava-bhārati*, *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* and *Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa*, the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* and *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* may be said to be close followers of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* so far as the Sandhyaṅgas are concerned. The first group of works omits *Prārthanā* from the list.⁹ Similar controversy regarding the acceptance of the *Ākṣepa* (*Utkṣiptam*) as an *aṅga* has also been noted before.

Abhinavagupta fails to assert which one of the sixty five Sandhyaṅgas, explained by himself, is to be dropped so that the total number becomes sixty four. He records a view that omits *Praśasti*, as it is not included in the subject matter of the play.¹⁰ Viśvanātha also informs us that some omit *Prārthanā* of the third Sandhi to make the total number sixty four and some omit *Praśasti* for the same purpose.¹¹

All the theorists of Indian dramaturgy and the commentators of plays are of opinion that the total number of Sandhyaṅgas is sixty four. The view had its origin in the dim past and can be taken as one of Bharata, no matter whether the term Bharata signifies a sage or the *naṭa-sampradāya* of the day, as taken by many.¹² The present *Nāṭya-śāstra* is the product of a long tradition and when it came to be codified, it acquired a religious sanctity. But even after its codification the dramatic literature went on developing and new situations and moods came to be depicted in those works, all of which certainly could not be explained by the earliest terminology and definitions of the Sandhyaṅgas. So, new terminology and definitions of the Sandhyaṅgas evolved, but always there was a persistent endeavour to keep the total number sixty four.

In the expositions of the respective Sandhyaṅgas it has

been shown that there are divergent views regarding their names and definitions. Moreover, some of the names of the *aṅgas* of the Pratimukha-sandhi (Vilāsa, Vidhūta, Narma, Narmadyuti) show that they were evolved, mainly for the analysis of love-plays. But the attempt of the later theorists and critics to make them suit in dramas with other sentiments depicted in the second Sandhi, resulted into twists of definitions of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. So far as the Sandhyaṅgas are concerned, the text of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* as followed by Sāgara is essentially similar to that followed by Abhinavagupta. It has been shown in respective places that where the readings of the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* do not agree with that accepted by Abhinavagupta, Sāgara finds support from manuscript readings recorded in the GOS. text or from the views referred to by Abhinavagupta¹³. That long before Sāgara, Abhinavagupta, Dhanañjaya and Rāmacandra-Guṇacandra, different versions of the Sandhyaṅga-portion of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* evolved is evident from the divergent views held and referred to in their works, (as noted above in respective connections) and also from the variant readings of the manuscripts of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* itself. Sāgara followed the text of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* that was available to him and evidently in that text there were names and definitions of sixty five Sandhyaṅgas in spite of the well-established view that their number is sixty four.

APPLICATION OF THE SANDHYANGAS

Sāgara himself says nothing explicitly regarding the problems whether the Sandhyaṅgas are to be used in the plays in the same order as they are enumerated and whether one *aṅga* of a particular Sandhi can be used in another Sandhi also. So far as the first problem is concerned, Sāgara seems to maintain that the Sandhyaṅgas need not necessarily be used in a play according to the order of their enumeration. This can be shown from the passages he cites for illustration from the Act I only of the *Venī-samhāra*.¹

Abhinavagupta clearly states that no order is required to be maintained in the use of the *aṅgas* of a particular Sandhi and refutes the theory of Udbhaṭa and others who hold that the *aṅgas* of a Particular Sandhi should be used in due order and in that Sandhi only.² According to Abhinavagupta an *aṅga* of a particular Sandhi can be used in another Sandhi also.³ He further states that if the Sandhyaṅgas occur one after another in due order, then Sandhyantaras and Lāsyaṅgas etc., cannot be used at all.⁴ From this remark it is event that according to Abhinavagupta Sandhyaṅgas are neither the subdivisions of Sandhis nor the Sandhis are mere combinations of Sandhyaṅgas arranged in an order, there are other elements to be used along with the *aṅgas* in a Sandhi.

Śāradātanaya and Śiṅgabdhūpāla maintain that no order is to be maintained in using the Sandhyaṅgas in a play.⁵ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* also maintains the same opinion and enumerates the Sandhyaṅgas in a different order than the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. The *Daśa-rūpaka* like the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* keeps mum, but Dhanika seems to support the view of Abhinavagupta as is evident from the illustrations he cites.⁶

Among the commentators it is Rāghava-bhaṭṭa who specifically states that the Sandhyaṅgas may be used in a play by altering the order in which they are enumerated and all the Sandhyaṅgas need not be used in a play.⁷ Kāṭayavema also gives no stress on their order, as is evident from his commentary on the *Mālavikāgnimitra*.⁸ Thus the view of Udbhaṭa, as referred to by Abhinavagupta, finds no support either from the theorists or from the commentators like Rāghava-bhaṭṭa and Kāṭayavema.

The view of Abhinavagupta and Rāmachandra regarding the problem whether an *aṅga* assigned to a particular Sandhi can be used in another Sandhi or not, has been discussed above. Abhinavagupta, however, maintains that some of the *aṅgas* of some Sandhis necessarily and naturally belong to those Sandhis only.⁹

The text of the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* on this point is not clear. It states : *saṃmiśrāṇyapi dvi-tri-saṃkhyā-yuktāni anantarasandhiteṣu bhavāntyetāni rasa-bhāvāpekṣayā*.¹⁰ It is

difficult to find out from this *sūtra*-like cryptic statement what Sāgara exactly means. In support of this statement Sāgara, however, quotes two easily intelligible verses, attributed to Ācārya, i.e., Bharata. The verses actually occur in the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.¹¹ The first one of these two verses means that poets considering Rasa and Bhāva should use the *aṅgas* in a drama according to the Sandhis. The second verse according to Abhinavagupta means that one *aṅga* assigned to a particular Sandhi may be used in another Sandhi and that an *aṅga* belonging to a particular Sandhi may be used there twice or thrice,¹² and also that a single *aṅga* may serve the purpose of the two or three *aṅgas*.¹³ In the light of this explanation of the two verses of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, quoted in support of the above statement of Sāgara, the statement itself may be taken to mean that according to the exigencies of Rasa and Bhāva (*rasabhāvāpekṣayā*) *aṅgas* of a particular Sandhi may be used in other Sandhis (*saṁmisrāṇyapi, anantara-sandhiteṣu*) and that a single *aṅga* may be used twice or thrice, or a single *aṅga* may serve the purpose of two or three *aṅgas* (*dvitri-saṁkhyā-yuktam*). In actual practice also some of the *aṅgas* are seen to be used more than once in a drama. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* points out that Saṁpheṭa and Vidrava in the *Veṇī-saṁhāra* and Vilāsa in the *Ratnāvalī* have been used more than once.¹⁴

Sāgara enjoins that these sixty four Sandhyaṅgas should be used by poets in Nāṭakas.¹⁵ This may be taken to be a general rule based on *yathā sandhi* etc., of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, quoted in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kōśa*.¹⁶ From this it cannot be concluded that according to Sāgara each and every Nāṭaka should contain all the *aṅgas*, as no attempt has been made in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kōśa* to locate all the *aṅgas* in a single Nāṭaka. Abhinavagupta also maintains that all the *aṅgas* may be used in a drama but not as a rule.¹⁷ This is also the opinion of Sārādātanaya. Among the theorists only Vidyānātha and Śiṅgabhūpāla illustrate all the sixty four Sandhyaṅgas, each from a single work. Vidyānātha, truly speaking, to illustrate the rules of dramaturgy, writes a novel Nāṭaka in five Acts

co-related to five Sandhis depicting the career of his patron Pratāparudra, upto his coronation. The drama itself is practically a part of the work *Pratāparudrayasobhāṣaṇa*. Śiṅgabhūpāla, however, illustrates sixty four Sandhyaṅgas from the Bālarāmāyaṇa and proudly declares his achievements.¹⁹

Among the commentators Dhunḍirāja is the single person in his class to point out all the Sandhyaṅgas from a single drama, the *Mudrārākṣasa*. The very nature of the Sandhyaṅgas shows that all of them cannot be used in a single drama of normal type. The *aṅgas* like Narma and Narmadyuti, intimately related to the Śṛṅgāra-rasa according to the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, cannot be comprehended to occur in a play like the *Mudrārākṣasa*. Logically speaking, no hard and fast rule can be formulated regarding the use of the Sandhyaṅgas, and this is the standpoint of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* itself. To sum up, according to Indian dramaturgy all the *aṅgas* of each Sandhi need not be used, neither they are to be used in a particular order nor all of them are to be confined to the particular Sandhi to which they are assigned.

III

NECESSITY AND NATURE OF THE SANDHYANGAS

Sandhyaṅgas are generally regarded as subdivisions of Sandhis and the subdivisions of each Sandhi are understood to have formed the Sandhi concerned.¹ But in the foregoing discussion² it has been shown that Sandhis are meant for a structural analysis of the plot and the Sandhyaṅgas only do not form a Sandhi.³ If the *aṅgas* of a particular Sandhi are regarded as its subdivisions, they cannot be logically expected to occur in another Sandhi which they actually do and this is accepted both in theory and practice, as shown above. So, strictly speaking Sandhyaṅgas cannot be treated as the subdivisions of Sandhis. Dr. Raghavan rightly remarks that the Sandhyaṅgas indicate so many points in the unfoldment of a story or action.⁴ In the *Nāṭya-śāstra* they are really treated as but different

moods and situations which help the expansion of the plot and leads the entire action to its logical conclusion.

The *Nāṭya-śāstra* maintains that the Sandhyaṅgas serve sixfold purposes ; other authorities also generally accept this view.⁵ Following the commentary of Abhinavagupta⁶ it may be stated that the Sandhyaṅgas help the gradual expansion of the plot to evoke the desired Rasa and rouse the interests of the audience. Through Sandhyaṅgas, the poet can conceal what ought to be done so, and a known story can be so modelled as to create suspense and wonder by giving it a new form. The *aṅgas* also contribute to the expansion of that which is more essential for the delineation of the Rasa. No conscious attempt should be there on the part of the poet to use them, that may spoil the very purpose of the Sandhyaṅgas. Like the Alaṅkāras their use should be *prayatnāntarānapekṣa*. All these have been very aptly and precisely stated in the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa*.⁷ According to the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, as followed by the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* the Sandhyaṅgas should be used considering the exigencies of the Rasa and Bhāva.⁸ The *Dhvan-yāloka*⁹ enjoins that the Sandhis and Sandhyaṅgas are to be used in a way so that they can contribute to the desired Rasa and not only to observe faithfully the precepts of the *Śāstra*. Abhinavagupta bitterly criticises the introduction of a love scene (*vilāsa*) between Duryodhana and Bhānumatī in the *Venī-saṃhāra*, as it is out of place there.¹⁰ In the light of the above discussion, Sandhyaṅgas cannot be considered as "having no real value" and their definition and classification also are not without any "substantial interest."¹¹

That the theory of Sandhis and Sandhyaṅgas was over-developed, is a fact. This becomes apparent when the entire scheme is taken into account with all the divergent views on their number, name and definition. There were also schools of thought which did not follow Bharata closely. At least one such school has been referred to in the *Bhāva-prakāśana*,¹² where Subandhu has been credited with a novel theory of Sandhis. The name of Drauhīni,

is also associated with this theory.¹³ It groups the Nāṭakas into five types of Pūrṇa, Praśānta, Bhāsvara, Lalita and Samagra. Their mutual difference lies in the nature and number of the Sandhis contained by each class. No trace of this theory is found in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and the Sandhis of Subandhu, as represented in the *Bhāva-prakāśana* have got no similarity with those of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. This is altogether a separate theory and the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* summarily dispenses with it as unsatisfactory and unrecognised by Bharata.¹⁴

Māṭṛgupta's view on Sandhis and the theory of Anusandhis of Lollaṭa have already been discussed. Then there is the Daśā-theory which is referred to and refuted by Abhinavagupta.¹⁵ This theory mainly divides each Avasthā into three Sthānas, *upakrama*, *upasaṃhāra* and *madhya*: each of these Sthānas has been divided into five Daśās (stages) Ārambha, Yatna etc. Thus there are fifteen Daśās in every Avasthā and altogether seventy-five Daśās in a drama. The theory is undoubtedly of post-Bharata origin and rejected by Abhinavagupta.

From the above, it is evident that structural analysis of plays attracted the attention of many a scholar in an early age in India. As a result there arose different theories and views. There was also a tendency to remodel and simplify the views of Bharata as was actually done by Subandhu and Māṭṛgupta. The Daśā-theory, the Sandhyantaras¹⁶ and the Anusandhis of Lollaṭa undoubtedly point out a drift towards over elaboration. There were also some authorities who tried to stick to the principles laid down by Bharata and Sāgara belongs to this group, but he pays due respect to other *pūrvācārya-s*, specially to Māṭṛgupta.

Another interesting tendency of grouping can be mentioned in this connection. Abhinavagupta refers to a view that makes no difference between the Lakṣanas and Sandhyaṅgas.¹⁷ Daṇḍin goes a step further and considers the Sandhyaṅgas, Vṛtṭyaṅgas and Lakṣaṇas as Alaṅkāras.¹⁸ Dr Raghavan rightly remarks, "Alaṅkāra in Daṇḍin is a wide

berth which can conveniently accommodate these and many more".¹⁹ From the standpoint of dramaturgy it may be said that the Sandhyāṅgas as different moods and situations contributing to the progress and forming parts of the dramatic action cannot be brought under Alāṅkāras, the poetical embellishments.

CHAPTER VI

SANDHYANTARAS

Sāgara omits the theories of Anusandhi and Daśā, both of which are referred to and rejected by Abhinavagupta; but treats the Sandhyantaras in details. The GOS. edition of the *Nāṭya-sāstra*, gives the names of twenty-one Sandhyantaras and the editor notes that some of the manuscripts enumerate them in the earlier part of the chapter.¹ The KSS. edition enumerates them in the earlier part of the chapter (XXI. 49-51). Abhinavagupta gives only a short exposition on the nature and utility of the Sandhyantaras but neither the *Nāṭya-sāstra* nor Abhinavagupta makes any attempt to define and illustrate them. Dhanañjaya and Viśvanātha clearly avoid the topic. Bhoja does not define the Sandhyantaras but illustrates each of them.² The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* at the end of the first Viveka refers to these, as according to the view of some and enumerates them.³ The *Bhāva-prakāśana* also simply gives a list of twenty-one Sandhyantaras.⁴ Chronologically speaking then, so far as the available texts are concerned, it is the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* first that defines and illustrates each of them. The *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* with its close follower the *Nāṭaka-condrikā* also, gives a detailed account of the Sandhyantaras with definitions and illustrations.⁵ *Saṅgīta-dāma-dara* also gives the names of the Sandhyantaras and there they are called the Pradeśas of the Sandhis, as in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*.⁶

Sāgara maintains that these twenty-one Pradeśas (situations, points) of the Sandhis occur in a play to serve some purpose and for the proper delineation of the plot, as many of them as are required may be used within the Sandhis.⁷ Thus, there is no hard and fast rule regarding the use of the Sandhyantaras. Śiṅgabhūpāla also opines that unlike the Sandhyaṅgas any one of these twenty-one

can be used anywhere within the Sandhis whenever necessary and without any restriction.⁸

Sāgara says nothing definite regarding the utility of the Sandhyantaras. The *Nāṭya-śāstra* seems to indicate that the necessity of these twenty-one lies in the role of their connecting the *aṅgas* of the Sandhis.⁹ The *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* also maintains that they are to prevent the looseness in the use of the Sandhyaṅgas and the *Nāṭaka-candrikā* repeats the same.¹⁰

Abhinavagupta himself gives little importance to the Sandhyantaras. He refers to two views regarding the purpose served by them in a drama. He informs us that according to some the Sandhyantaras fill up the gaps between the Sandhyaṅgas and thus they are primarily related to the *aṅgas*.¹¹ Others, as stated by Abhinavagupta, maintain that they are but varieties of the Sandhyaṅgas like Upakṣepa etc., each of which may be of different varieties.¹² A single *aṅga* Upakṣepa has been shown as of different variety in different drama. It is *krodhātma* in the *Veṇī-saṁhāra*, *bhayaātma* in the *Rāmābhyudaya*, *svapnarūpa* in the *Pratimāniruddha* and *hetvavadhāraṇātma* in the *Udāttarāghava*.¹³ Thus the Sandhyantaras have, according to this view, got no separate entity besides the Sandhyaṅgas, they are but to indicate the special marks of the latter group of sixty-four. Abhinavagupta himself understands them as nothing more than the Vibhāva, Anubhāva and Vyabhicāribhāva; they are the causes of brightness (*ujjvalatvāhetu*) of the Prayoga (dramatic performance).¹⁴ Abhinavagupta further says that the Sandhyantaras occur in all types of plays and as they can be easily discerned they need not be illustrated.¹⁵ Thus, Abhinavagupta neither rejects the Sandhyantaras altogether, nor attaches much importance to them. The *Daśa-rūpaka* maintains that they may be covered by the Alaṅkāras or Vyabhicāribhāvas¹⁶ and as such, require no separate treatment. Following the *Abhinava-bhāratī*, the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* also maintains that the Sandhyantaras require no elaborate treatment, as some of them (*Sāma* etc.) are identical with the Sandhyaṅgas, some (*Matī* etc.) are Vyabhicāri-bhāvas,

some (Dūta, Lekha etc.) are but the very incidents of the plot of the play, while others are but the varieties of Upakṣepa etc.¹⁷ Thus, excepting Sāgara, Bhoja and Śiṅga-bhūpāla, none of the authorities takes any interest in the definitions and illustrations of the Sandhyantaras.

There is a general agreement among the different lists of twenty-one Sandhyantaras found in different works excepting minor variations. Sāgara and Śubhaṅkara read Dhī, Rujah and Upadhi instead of Hri, Ojas and Lekha of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. The *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* also reads Dhī. The *Bhāva-prakāśana* enumerates both Upadhi and Lekha and omits Dhī or Hri. It reads Hāsa instead of Sāhasa of others.

Sāgara further states that into the Sandhis there may be introduced aerial voice uttered by a celestical person and the reading of letters and in support of his statement quotes an anonymous authority.¹⁸ Again after discussing the four Pataḥkāsthānas, Sāgara states, *svapnodūtaḥ nepathyākāśavacanam likhitānyanantara-sandhiṣu kathyante*.¹⁹ Svapna and Dūta have been included by Sāgara in the list of the twenty-one. Dr Raghavan points out²⁰ that this line of the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* seems to be a reference to the view of Mātrgupta, as quoted by Rāghavabhaṭṭa in the *Arthadyotanikā*. Rāghavabhaṭṭa says : *ukto mātṛguptācāryaiḥ svapno dūtaśca lekhaśca nepathyoktistathaiva hi/ākāśa vacanam ceti jñeyā hyantara-sandhyayah*.²¹ This gives us another important information that among the ancient authorities on the subject Mātrgupta also accepts the Sandhyantaras. Excepting Nepathyokti and Ākāśa-vacana, other names given in the above verse of Mātrgupta, occur also in the list of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. It is interesting to note that the number of the Sandhyantaras like that of the Sandhyaṅgas, also went on increasing and Sāgara takes into account at least twenty-four of them including Lekhyokti, Nepathya-vacana and Ākāśa-vacana from different sources. The Upadhi found in the lists of the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa*, *Bhāva-prakāśana* and *Saṅgīta-dāmodara* is found neither in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* nor in any other text. The Dhī is found as a variant of the Hri in one manuscript.²² The first

anonymous authority cited by Sāgara does not refer to Mātṛgupta whose view, however, has also been recorded in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa*. Mātṛgupta accepts Nepathyokti and Ākāśa-vacana as two separate Sandhyantaras. Thus Sāgara had before him another authority excepting Mātṛgupta who counted Ākāśa-vacana as a Sandhyantara.

From the treatment of the Sandhyantaras by most of the authorities, as discussed before, it appears that the theory was not given much importance to in the face of the more elaborate scheme of the Sandhyaṅgas. Śingabhūpāla maintains that some Ācārya approves of their utility : *ācārya-ntara-saṅgatyā camatkāro vidhiyate*.²³ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* also expressly states that the Sandhyantaras are taken into account by some theorists only.²⁴ These facts tend to support the assumption that the Sandhyantaras are post-Bharatan.²⁵ But neither Abhinavagupta nor any other authority gives any such hint. Abhinavagupta accepts them as Bharatan without any suspicion, as it appears from his commentary. The above statements of the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* and *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* may simply mean that some theorists do not approve of any utility of the Sandhyantaras while some attach importance to them. It is also a fact that all the topics of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* are not equally treated by each and every later authority.

The *Nāṭya-śāstra* gives no definition of the Sandhyantaras and this also cannot be taken to be an indication of their post-Bharatan origin. Perhaps no necessity was felt to define these common features of plays, as maintained by Abhinavagupta. Their definitions gradually took shape in the hands of later authorities.

Sāgara himself in most cases gives only the synonyms of the names of Sandhyantaras while explaining²⁶ them and these are in no sense can be called as definitions. The Dāna has only been illustrated²⁷ and a curious explanation has been given to Māyā as fraud planned by the demon Maya to deceive the gods, while for illustration a situation is referred to from the *Sugrīvāṅka*, where false Hanumat has been used against Sugrīva.²⁸ Sāgara, however,

cannot be credited as the first authority to explain and illustrate the Sandhyantaras, as he himself refers to other's views in this matter. He defines Rujā as physical pain caused by blow etc., and then says that others include even the sight of an evil omen causing mental anguish in Rujā.²⁹ The definitions of Sandhyantaras given in the *Rasārnava-sudhākara* on the other hand, are fuller and in most cases have got no apparent similarity with those found in the *Nāṭika-lakṣaṇa*. Sāgara's treatment of these twenty-one thus seems to represent an early stage in the development of their definitions which took a definite form by the time of Śiṅgabhūpala, i.e. 14th century A.D.

It has been pointed out above that Rāghavabhaṭṭa quotes the view of Mātṛgupta to support that the Nepathya-vacana is a Sandhyantara. But at least in ten cases the said commentator, while pointing out other Sandhyantaras, quotes their definitions from the *Rasārnava-sudhākara*.³⁰ The quotation concerned from the text of Mātṛgupta, as given above, only enumerates some Sandhyantaras but gives no definition. As Nepathya-vacana and Ākāśa-bhāṣita have not been taken into account as Sandhyantaras in the *Rasārnava-sudhākara*, Rāghavabhaṭṭa gives no definition of them. From this it may be supposed that Mātṛgupta himself also did not define the Sandhyantaras. Probably their definitions began to take shape after Mātṛgupta and did not reach to a final stage even upto the time of Sāgara.

At present, however, there is nothing to prove conclusively that the Sandhyantaras were not included in the original *Nāṭya-śāstra* and that some other seer formulated them. If they were included in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* after Mātṛgupta we could have found the names of Ākāśa-vacana and Nepathyokti in the list given there. It can thus be accepted unhasitatingly that the Sandhyantaras were there in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* at least before Mātṛgupta. Mātṛgupta took up the Sandhyantaras from the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and increased their number at least by two, Nepathya-vacana and Ākāśa-vacana. We, of course, know nothing definite about Mātṛgupta's opinion regarding the purpose served by the Sandhyantaras in a play.

CHAPTER VII

PATĀKĀSTHĀNAKA

Patākāsthānaka is a dramatic artifice to foreshadow future events. It signifies particular spots in the body of the theme of a play where an equivocal speech or situation suggests, indicates or brings on, or helps to bring on a coming event. Sāgara describes the Patākāsthānaka as :

yatrānyasmiṃścintyamāne talliṅgo'nyaḥ prayujyate |
*āgantukena bhāvena patākāsthānakam tu tat ||*¹

The *Nāṭya-śāstra* (GOS) reads the first pāda of the verse as : *yatrārthe cintite'nyasmin*, but the reading of the *Nāṭya-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* is found in a ms.² By *āgantuka-bhāva* Sāgara understands Vyabhicāribhāva. Thus, according to Sāgara, that is Patākāsthānaka, where something is being thought of but some other things having the same characteristics (*talliṅga*) is indicated or introduced through a V yabhicāribhāva. For illustration, Sāgara refers to the *Daśarathāṅka* and says : *daśaratho rāmasya rāje cintyamāne bharatasya rājam talliṅga-jātamiti viśādenāgantukena vyabhicāriṇā bhāvena gṛhītaḥ paṭhati ramo'pi gacchatu vanamityādi*.³ But this interpretation of Sāgara is quite novel and is not accepted by any other theorist. There may be a change of Bhāva in the acting of a character on the stage due to the indication of some future event, but that indication is not given by any other Bhāva, *āgantuka-bhāva* here in this context simply means some accidental or extraneous matter which is not in hand. Abhinavagupta says : *sahakāri-kṛtam āgantukam ucyate*.⁴ We know that in a play every episode is *sahakāri* to the *pradhāna-vṛtta*. In the gradual development of a plot the playwright introduces at places new turns to the course of action and gives hint to the future event by bringing in something not expected at the present moment (*āgantuka-bhāva*). These spots are called Patākāsthānakas in Sanskrit dramaturgy.

The *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa*, *Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa*, *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* and the *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* follow the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and maintain that there are four types of Patākāsthānakas. But the *Daśa-rūpaka* accepts only two varieties of the Patākāsthānaka, inasmuch as, the similarity between the indicating matter and the matter indicated lies in respect of situation or attribute.⁵ Dhanika clarifies this and says that where the indication is given through the *alaṅkāra* Anyokti, it is the first type (known as Tulyasamvidhānaka) and in the case of the second type (named Tulyaviśeṣaṇaka) the indication is offered by the *alaṅkāra* Samāsokti.⁶ Śāradātanaya seems to have expanded this theory to make it corroborate to the view of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. Śiṅgabhūpāla and Rūpagosvāmin also follow suit. They maintain that the Tulyasamvidhānaka variety of the Patākāsthānaka is of three kinds conforming respectively to the first three varieties of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and that the Tulyaviśeṣaṇa variety is a kind by itself and corresponds to the fourth Patākāsthānaka of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.⁷ But none of the theorists like Abhinavagupta, Sāgara, Bhoja and Rāmacandra-Guṇacandra refer to this view. Neither the standpoint of the *Daśa-rūpaka* in this respect, nor its elaborated form as in the *Bhāva-prakāśana* etc., can be supported by the canons of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. The *Daśa-rūpaka* maintains clearly a different view from that of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* regarding the Patākāsthānakas and Śāradātanaya with a synthetic outlook tries to correlate the two. Śiṅgabhūpāla seems to have followed the *Bhāva-prakāśana* in this respect.

Sāgara, Bhoja, Śāradātanaya, Viśvanātha and Śiṅgabhūpāla quote the definitions of the four Patākāsthānakas verbatim from the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. Rāmacandra-Guṇacandra in their own way offer *sūtra*-like definitions, but in the gloss follow the *Nāṭya-śāstra* closely. In the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* the order of the Patākāsthānakas is found to be a bit changed. The fourth variety of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* is the third one of the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* and vice-versa.⁸ Dhanañjaya sticks to his own position and Dhanika illustrates two types of Patākāsthānakas.

The first Patākāsthānaka according to the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kōśa*, consists in the immediate fulfilment of the desired end (*tatkṣaṇādeva samīhasyārthasya niṣpattiḥ*) through the attainment of the object longed for (*abhivāṇchana-siddhiniṣpādanataḥ*).⁹ The illustration is given from the *Nāgānanda* where Jīmūtavāhana wishes to sacrifice himself but Śaṅkhacūḍa refuses to give him the *vadhyacihna*, the purpose of which is served by a pair of red cloth, sent by the mother of Mitrāvasu through the Kañcukin, who hands it over to the hero. Abhinavagupta also offers the same illustration¹⁰ along with another from the *Ratnāvalī*.

The second Patākāsthānaka is a statement having double meanings (*śliṣṭam vacanam*) and incorporating many purposes (*bahvartha-samādhānam*) forming the basis of the composition (*prastutasya kāvyayāśrayam*).¹¹ The verse *nirvāṇa-vairadahanā* etc., recited by the Sūtradhāra in the *Prastāvanā* of the *Veṇī-saṃhāra* has been chosen to be the illustration.¹² The verse through Śleṣa refers to the annihilation of the Kauravas and the victory of the Pāṇḍavas, though apparently it expresses the welfare of both the parties. This verse of the *Veṇī-saṃhāra* undoubtedly forms the basis of the play as it arouses the wrath of Bhīma and also contains the central theme in a nutshell.

The third Patākāsthānaka, as Sāgara describes it, consists in the intimation of the object (*arthaprakāśam*) with courtesy and in a subtle way through exchanges of equivocal words.¹³ Sāgara illustrates this Patākāsthānaka by citing a verse, evidently not from any play, of an unknown poet. The verse contains equivocal dialogues between a *khaṇḍitā-nāyikā* and the *nāyaka*.¹⁴ The more common illustration, however, is the dialogue of Cāṇakya and Siddhārthaka in *Mudrārākṣasa*, (Act. I) :

Cāṇakya:-*api nāma durātmā rākṣaso gṛhyeta ?*

Siddhārthaka:-(*Praviśya*) *aam gaṇhido*¹⁵

Rāghavabhaṭṭa quotes the same definition as in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* of the third Patākāsthānaka twice with a minor variation but ascribes it to Mātṛgupta¹⁶ It shows that

Maṭṭgupta in his work on dramaturgy took some verses from the *Nāṭya-śāstra* verbatim.

The fourth Patākāsthānaka, according to Sāgara consists in a well-knit and ambiguous arrangement of words giving reasons (*upapattimān*) and capable of linking the motive of the composition (*kāvya-yojana-kṣama*).¹⁷ For illustration a verse, addressed to Sītā by Rāma, has been quoted from the *Jānakīrāghava*.¹⁸ The verse carries two meanings:— (1) this Aśoka garden will charm thee with its blossoms; (2) perhaps Rāvaṇa having the Puṣpaka chariot will carry thee off in the pleasure garden. Thus it suggests the motive of the action, i.e., the abduction of Sītā.

The verse *uddāmotkalikām* etc., in the Act II of the *Ratnāvalī* has been cited as an illustration of the fourth Patākāsthānaka in the *Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa*, *Bhāva-prakāśana*, *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* and *Sāhitya-darpaṇa*.¹⁹ All these works appear to be influenced by the *Avaloka* where the said verse has been quoted as an illustration of the Tulyaviśeṣaṇa variety of Patākāsthānaka,²⁰ which is taken to be the same as the fourth one of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, as pointed out before. But Abhinavagupta clearly states²¹ that this verse cannot be taken as an illustration of the fourth Patākāsthānaka, on the other hand it is an example of Vyāhāra an *aṅga* of the Vithī.

Dr S. N. Shastri says that the subsidiary portion of the plot is of three kinds: the Patākā, Prakarī and the Patākāsthānakas.²² This is the view of Śāradātanaya alone²³ and is not maintained by any other authority including the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. The Patākāsthānakas in no way can be considered as constituting a sub-division of the Prāsāṅgika-vṛtta. They are really decorations adding charm to the composition, as stated by Sāgara.²⁴ The *Nāṭya-śāstra* itself states: *catuspatākā-paramaṃ nāṭake kāryam iṣyate*.²⁵ Abhinavagupta also maintains that they add beauty to the composition but refers to a view that takes them as *dūṣaṇas*.²⁶ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* too emphasises this decorative aspect of the Patākāsthānakas and enjoins that there should not

be any play devoid of it. It also maintains that all the Patākāsthānakas are equally essential.²⁷

Dr S. N. Shastri further maintains that Sāgara recommends the use of the four Patākāsthānakas "in succession in the first four junctures commencing with the Protasis in a drama."²⁸ It is a fact that Sāgara restricts their use in first four Sandhis only and clearly states that the last Sandhi should not have any Patākāsthānaka.²⁹ At the conclusion of the discussion on the topic Sāgara states : *asya prayogo mukhādi-sandhi-catuṣṭaye kvāpi vidhātavyaḥ*.³⁰ Here the pronoun *asya* may refer to the Patākāsthānaka in general or only the fourth one. In the first case the statement simply means that a Patākāsthānaka may be used anywhere in the first four Sandhis ; if the second alternative is accepted, then it means that the fourth Patākāsthānaka may be used in the first four Sandhis. In any case, the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* does not appear to have recommended the use of the four Patākāsthānakas in succession. On the other hand, Sāgara seems to maintain that they may be used without any restriction in the first four Sandhis. That there was a confusion regarding the use of the Patākāsthānakas in a play, is evident from the statement of Abhinavagupta. The great commentator refers to and rejects the view as untenable that restricts the use of these four in first four Sandhis in succession and takes the words *prathama*, *dvitīya* etc., before them as indicating their occurrence in the Mukha Sandhi, Pratimukha-sandhi etc., respectively.³¹ Viśvanātha also refers to the view as maintained by some, but he himself advocates the free and frequent use of the Patākāsthānakas in all the Sandhis without any restriction, as they are very much admirable,³² evidently due to their power of enhancing the beauty of the composition.

There is another view referred to in the Abhinavabhāratī that establishes a relation between the Patākā-nāyaka and the Patākāsthānaka. This view upholds that in the first four Sandhis there should be as many as four Patākā-nāyakas and each should be indicated successively by the four

Patākāsthānakas. Abhinavagupta rightly criticises this view as *asat*.³³ Another theory, referred to and rejected by Abhinavagupta as *upahāsapātrīkṛtaḥ pakṣaḥ*, makes the number of the Patākāsthānakas as five.³⁴ All these confusing views seem to have had their origin to the attempt of bringing the plot of a play into a mechanical framework of divisions. The Sandhis are five in number, so also are the Avasthās, Arthaprakṛtis and Arthopakṣepakas. This fact might have tempted some later theorist to raise the number of the Patākāsthānakas to five. We have also seen that some authors endeavoured to correlate the Sandhis, Avasthās and Arthaprakṛtis. A similar attempt was also made to tag the Patākāsthānakas with the Sandhis. All these views are decidedly later but they were formed long before Abhinavagupta and also the number of their adherents was not too negligible to be overlooked by the great commentator.

It has been shown that according to Sāgara there should be no Patākāsthānaka in the Nirvahaṇa-sandhi, they are to be used in the first four Sandhis only. It may be argued that even at the beginning of the Nirvahaṇa-sandhi the final object comes very near to be accomplished and there remains practically no future event to be indicated by a Patākāsthānaka. From a study of the Sandhis, as has already been done, it appears that after the Vimarśa-sandhi the final result comes to be almost a determined fact and as such, there is but a very little scope of a Patākāsthānaka in the Nirvahaṇa-sandhi.

Sāgara, however, is not the propounder of the above theory. It is Mātrgupta, if Rāghavabhaṭṭa is to be believed, who recommended that the four Patākāsthānakas should be used in the first four Sandhis, but whether in succession or not, is not clear from the quotation found in the Arthadyotanikā. Rāghavabhaṭṭa says : *eṣāṃ sthānam apyuktaṃ mātrgūptācāryaiḥ-mukhe pratimukhe garbhe vimarśe ca caturṣvapi/bhedāḥ sandhiṣu kartavyāḥ patākāsthānakasya tu*³⁵|| The verse seems to mean that different Patākāsthānakas are to be used in the first four Sandhis. Among the authors of extant works on dramaturgy, Sāgara is the most ardent follower of

Mātṛgupta and his standpoint, as discussed above, supports this view. From the statement *patākāsthānakasya bhedāḥ sandhiṣu kartavyāḥ*, it does not definitely follow that the Patākāsthānakas are to be used in succession. But this theory of the use of Patākāsthānakas in succession in the first four Sandhis, also seems to be very old. A definition of the first Patākāsthānaka, ascribed to Ādi-bharata by Rāghavabhaṭṭa gives a hint to this theory. Rāghavabhaṭṭa states : *tallakṣaṇam ādi-bharate—sahasai-vārtha-sampattir-nāyakasyo-pakārikā/ patākā-sthānakam sandhau prathame(?) tanmatam*||³⁶ Here it is said that this is the description of the Patākāsthānaka which is to be used in the first Sandhi, i.e., the first Patākāsthānaka is restricted to the first Sandhi. It can reasonably be surmised that the adherents of this view advocated the use of other three also in succession in the three following Sandhis. Again the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, enjoins that Patākā, the *vyāpi-prāsaṅgika-vṛtta*, is to be closed at least in the Vimarśa-sandhi, after which there is no scope of a Patākāsthānaka according to the above two views ascribed to Mātṛgupta and Ādi-bharata respectively. From this perhaps the tendency to establish a relation between the Patākā and Patākāsthānaka had developed and ultimately gave rise to the view that established a correlation among the four Sandhis, four Patākāsthānakas and four Patākānāyakas. The theory has rightly been exploded by Abhinavagupta, as shown before. The view of Śāradātanaya that the Patākāsthānaka forms a subdivision of the Prāsaṅgika-vṛtta is also based on the same tendency, as above. The above theory ascribed to Ādi-bharata was further elaborated and the number of the Patākāsthānakas was raised to five to fit in with the five Sandhis and a theory of mechanical correlation was thus established. It is interesting to note that all these theories developed as early as to be refuted by Abhinavagupta. It also shows to what extent the author of Indian dramaturgy have shown their extraordinary genius for correlation and classification.

CHAPTER VIII

DIVISIONS OF A PLAY FOR REPRESENTATION

(i) ANKA (ACT)

Avasthās, Arthaprakṛtis and Sandhi-Sandhyaṅga-Sandhyantarās, we have seen, serve to analyse the plot of a well-knit play. The readers and critics are mainly interested in them. The playwright himself should possess a thorough knowledge of these divisions while constructing the plot. For the sake of an artistic representation on the stage, the body of the play is divided into several sections and these sections, according to their nature and purpose are called Anka, Viṣkambhaka and Praveśaka, as the case may be. This division entirely depends upon the consideration that how a play can be best represented on the stage maintaining an abiding interest of the audience.

Anka, says Sāgara, is the *paricehodayitā* of the *ākhyāna-grantha*,¹ i.e., it divides the sections of the play. Each of these sections, enjoins the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*, should contain various actings (*prayogaḥ*) and should be pervaded (*upagūḍha*) with different types of Bhāvas and Rasas.² This is said as an exposition to *nānā-vidhāna-yukto bhāvai rasaiśca gūḍho bhavet*,³ taken evidently from the *Nāṭya-śāstra* where the whole verse is read as :

anka iti rūḍhi-śabdo bhāvaiśca rasaiśca rohayatyarthān /
*nānā-vidhāna-yukto yasmāt tasmād bhavedankaḥ ||*⁴

The first half of Sāgara's quotation occurs as the third foot of the verse from *Nāṭya-śāstra*, but the reading of the second half is not exactly the same as that of the second foot in *Nāṭya-śāstra*. Here Abhinavagupta informs us that some theorists headed by Lolīṭa accept the reading *gūḍha*. The *Abhinava-bhāratī* here reads, *anka iti rūḍhiśabda iti / bhāvaiś rasaiśca gūḍhaśchannaḥ vyāpto rīho nka-śabdena yādycc hikenocyate iti bhaṭṭa-lolīṭādyāḥ gūḍha iti pāṭham vyācakṣire/*

anye rohayatyarthāniti pañhanti.⁵ Thus the reading of the second foot of the above verse from the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, according to Lollaṭa seems to be *bhāvaiḥ rasaiśca gūḍho bhavet* exactly similar to that of the second half of the hemistich quoted by Sāgara, as given above. Thus the reading of the first foot of the same verse according to Lollaṭa, as appears from the above text of *Abhinava-bhāratī* is : *aṅka iti rūḍhiśabda* i.e., *aṅka* is a *yādrochika-śabda* as Abhinavagupta puts it.⁶ According to this interpretation *aṅka* is a *saṃjñā-śabda* : i.e., *aṅka*, as used in dramatic literature is simply a name having no derivative meaning and is applied in its particular sense through traditional sanction. The reading, *rohayatyarthān*, implies that *Aṅka* is so called as it nourishes the theme as if on its lap.⁷ This is undoubtedly an instance of folk-etymology but authorities like Dhanika, Śiṅgabhūpāla and Sārādātanaya adopt it.⁸ Abhinavagupta maintains that the word *aṅka* here in this context is purely a *rūḍhi śabda*, but in another place he says that the section of a play is so named as it is marked by various Rasas.⁹

The poet, according to Sāgara is to take into consideration the entire action while constructing the *Aṅkas* of a play. He is to consider the Sandhyaṅgas, Avasthās and the expansion of the Bindu etc., in dividing a play into *Aṅkas*.¹⁰ The Bindu, we know, serves to maintain a connecting link and thereby a continuity in the development of the plot. This implies that every succeeding Act should naturally follow the preceeding one as a direct continuation of the plot.

Indian theorists in general, maintain that the number of *Aṅkas* in a full-fledged *Nāṭaka* or *Prakaraṇa* may be from the minimum five to the maximum ten.¹¹ Abhinavagupta opines that the *Aṅkas* should correlate to the Avasthās, an *Aṅka* should be closed with the end of an Avasthā. The Bindu, that acts like a linking thread, should at the close of each *Aṅka*, be so placed as to connect it with the following *Aṅka*. Thus there should be at least five *Aṅkas* corresponding to five Avasthās in a *Nāṭaka*,¹² and the Bindu at the end of each *Aṅka* is to give a fresh impetus to the further development of the plot. Abhinavagupta further maintains that if the

first Avasthā demands a larger space it can take two Aṅkas and in this way due to the exigencies of other Avasthās the number of Aṅkas may be increased from six to ten but not more.¹³ Abhinavagupta holds, as has been shown before, that the five Sandhis rest on the five successive Avasthās. Now, it appears that according to Abhinavagupta there should be at least five Aṅkas depicting five Sandhis and Avasthās in a Pūrṇa-sandhi-rūpaka; i.e., Nāṭaka or Prakaraṇa. An Avasthā and its corresponding Sandhi may cover two Aṅkas and thus there may be upto ten Aṅkas in a Nāṭaka. So, according to Abhinavagupta no Avasthā or Sandhi can either be ended before the close of an Aṅka or be started from within an Aṅka. A Sandhi or Avasthā should be started at the beginning of an Aṅka and should also be concluded at the end of an Aṅka.¹⁴ From the above, it can also be inferred that no Sandhi and its corresponding Avasthā can occupy more than two Aṅkas according to Abhinavagupta. But this rigid theory of Abhinavagupta, as can be made out from the defective text, has found little recognition to the theorists and commentators. Viśvanātha allots the entire portion from the beginning of the Act IV up to the situation prior to the recognition of Śakuntalā in the Act VII of the *Abhijñāna-śakuntala* to Vimarśa-sandhi.¹⁵ The Acts III, IV and V of the *Veṇī-saṃhāra* comprise the Garbha-sandhi according to the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa*.¹⁶ Dhruṇḍī points out that the Act I of the *Mudrā-rākṣasa* contains first two Sandhis and the last three Acts of the same Nāṭaka have been allotted to the Nirvaḥaṇa Sandhi by the same commentator.¹⁷ According to Rāghava-bhaṭṭa the Mukha-sandhi in the *Abhijñāna-śakuntala* ends within the Act II, wherefrom the Pratimukha-sandhi begins; similarly the Garbha-sandhi closes within the Act V and from there the Vimarśa-sandhi begins.¹⁸ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa*, a work of a dramatist, follows *Abhinava-bhāratī* mainly, but in this respect it clearly states that a single Avasthā, if required, can be delineated even throughout three Acts¹⁹ and gives an illustration from the *Veṇī-saṃhāra* as noted above. It further informs us that according to

the traditional view (*vrddhasampradāya*) an Avasthā should be ended with the end of an Act but there are some who maintain that it can be concluded even before the end of the Act concerned, i.e., within the Act. The authors, however, appear to have supported both the views.²⁰ Here by *vrddhasampradāya* the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* refers to the view upheld by Abhinavagupta.

The *Nāṭya-śāstra* nowhere clearly states that there exists any correlation between the Aṅkas and Avasthā-Sandhis of a drama. The poet is given a free hand to exercise. Sāgara also keeps silent about the problems as where an Avasthā is to be concluded and how many Aṅkas can be occupied by a single Avasthā or Sandhi. It should be noted here that Sāgara accepts no parallelism between Avasthās and Sandhis and the matter has been fully discussed before. No hard and fast rule can be formulated regarding the relation between an Avasthā and an Aṅka and this seems to be the implication of Sāgara's silence here in this respect.

Regarding the general rule about the number of Acts in a Nāṭaka, A. B. Keith rightly observes, "the rule is generally obeyed, but late dramas styling themselves Nāṭakas are known of one (Ravidāsa's *Mithyājñānaviḍambana*), two (Vedāntavāgīśa's *Bhojacarita*), three or four acts, and one comparatively early work exists in one version of fourteen acts, the *Mahānāṭaka*; the *Adbhūtārṇava* of a Kavibhūṣaṇa has twelve acts."²¹ Some of Bhāsa-dramas may be included in this list. But most of the works named above may not be styled Nāṭaka proper. Prof. Sivaprasad Bhattacharya maintains that the *Mahānāṭaka* is a hand book of the Kathakas who recite and explain the epics and the Purāṇas.²²

For further exposition of the Aṅka Sāgara quotes from the *Nāṭya-śāstra* :

yatrārthasya samāptiryatra ca bijasya bhavati saṁhāraḥ |
kimcidavalagna-binduḥ so'ṅka iti sadāvagantavyaḥ ||^{22a}

This verse according to Sāgara's gloss enjoins that in an Aṅka a particular incident (*arthasyānuśaṅgikasya*) is to be fully delineated and a partial development of the main

theme is to be depicted (*pradhānārthasyāṃśataḥ saṃharanam*) while the Bindu is to maintain the link.²³ Abhinavagupta interprets the verse according to the traditional view to mean that a certain Avasthā and its corresponding Sandhi should be completed in an Aṅka, but himself admits that this has already been said in the verse, *asyāvasthopetam* etc.²⁴ So, he opines, that the verse speaks of three types of Aṅkas and quotes the view of Kohala (and others ?) that enumerates and defines those, viz., Cūḍāṅka (Cūlikāṅka), Avatārāṅka and Aṅkamukha.²⁵ This view of Kohala will be taken up in our discussion on the Arathopakṣepakas. At present it is to be noted that this view of Kohala finds no mention in any of the works like the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa*, *Daśa-rūpaka*, *Bhāva-prakāśana* etc.

Following the *Nāṭya-śāstra* the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* enjoins that there should be only four or five Nāyakas in a Nāṭaka and in Aṅkas their actions are to be depicted along with different circumstances (*nānā-daśā-yukto'ṅkaḥ*); but these actions should not be protracted leaving the main issue which is made to be served by them.²⁶ Sāgara takes the word *nāyaka* to signify in this context both the chief hero and other leading characters like the heroine, the secondary hero, the enemy of the hero even, who is to be killed.²⁷ The *Nāṭya-śāstra* says: *sannihitanāyako'ṅkaḥ kartavyo nāṭake prakaraṇe vā*.²⁸ Sāgara in his gloss on this hemistich says that in every Aṅka any one of the above Nāyakas must be present. The examples of this principle are given from the *Veṇī-saṃhāra* and the two Nāṭakas *Māyāmadālasā* and *Nāgānanda* are cited as having the principle hero in every Aṅka.²⁹ To furnish an Aṅka with different Rasas, not only the actions of the leading characters but those of others like queens, their retinues, priests, ministers and merchants are to be presented.³⁰

II

What is and what is not permissible
to be visibly represented in an Act

representation, as demanded in an *Aṅka* of Indian theorists, of above incident is a very difficult affair even on a modern stage.

Dr M. M. Ghosh maintains³⁷ that both the above verses of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* enumerate items which are not permissible to be visibly represented on the stage. He accepts the reading, *aṅka pratyakṣajāni* (*aṅke apratyakṣajāni*) instead of *aṅke pratyakṣa*...in the verse *krodha-prasāda* etc. This is the reading of the KSS. edition of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.³⁸ Dr M. M. Ghosh, the KSS. and KM. editions of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* read the verse, *yuddham rājya* etc., immediately after the verse *krodha-prasāda* etc.³⁹ But Sāgara, Bhoja and Abhinavagupta do not support this reading and interpretation. They maintain that the *Nāṭya-śāstra* permits the visible representation of feats of anger, favour, grief etc., in an *Aṅka*. This view seems to be practical. Apparently, from common sense it may be said, there is no difficulty in representing feats of anger etc., on the stage without hampering the development of *Rasa*. It may be added here that in practice also, Indian dramatists do not hesitate to depict *krodha* etc., in *Aṅkas*. In the *Veṇī-saṁhāra* the feats of anger may be said to be a regular feature in almost all the Acts. *Prasāda* and *śoka* are not rare in our dramas. *Śāpot-sarga*, in the sense in which it is taken by Abhinavagupta, is present in the *Abhijñāna-śakuntala*. *Vidrava* is itself a *Sandhyaṅga*⁴⁰ and a scene of marriage is there in the *Viddhaśālābhāṅjikā* of Rājasekhara. Marriage is also the theme of the *Pārvatīpariṇaya*.

The introduction of death scenes in Sanskrit drama is a much discussed problem. Scholars, both foreign and Indian, mostly are of opinion that ancient Indian dramatic convention did not permit the introduction of death scenes on the stage.⁴¹ In the light of this opinion the much debated *Bhāsa* problem has also been judged. *Bhāsa* in depicting death scenes freely in the *Aṅkas*^{41a} has either been alleged of breaking the rules of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* or has been placed before Bharata. So, the matter deserves special attention.

Regarding the prohibition of the visible representation of death on the stage, later theorists are of one mind. They do not permit death scenes on the stage. Death is simply to be reported to or described in a summary way in the *Praveśaka* or the like. Death of the main hero or heroine, however, should not even be so described and if described or visibly represented for the sake of the plot he (or she) should be restored to life,⁴² as is the case in the *Nāgānanda* and the *Mṛcchakaṭīka*. *Jīmūtavāhana* and *Vasantasenā* are both visibly restored to life on the stage.

Regarding the main hero, the *Nāṭyā-śāstra* also enjoins that in an *Aṅka* or *Praveśaka* of a *Nāṭaka* or *Prakaraṇa*, there should be no death of the *Nāyaka*; his flight, treaty or capture may, however, be depicted.⁴³ This is quite in consonance with the happy ending of Sanskrit drama. Sanskrit drama, as a rule, ends with the achievement of the desired object by the main hero. *Abhinavagupta* also asserts that the death of the main hero should neither be represented visibly in an *Aṅka* nor even be reported to in *Praveśaka* etc.⁴⁴ *Abhinavagupta* informs us that according to some even the *Patākānāyaka* etc., also are to enjoy this privilege; and some others prohibits the visible representation of even the striking of the main hero by some one.⁴⁵ *Sāgara* too maintains that in an *Aṅka*, as a rule, neither the actual death of the main hero who is to prosper at the end, nor even that of the villain should be depicted, but their flight, peace or capture only may be shown.⁴⁶ This injunction, adds *Sāgara*, is not absolute as the hero's enemies like *Rāvaṇa*, *Duryodhana* and *Kaṃsa* etc., in *Nāṭakas* are to be killed eventually. But that killing should not be visibly represented i.e., if necessary, may be reported in a *Praveśaka* or the like. In a *Prakaraṇa*, however, the poet is free in the matter of the plot and there the hero may be represented as making peace with the enemy, if the occasion so deserves; as for example *Cārudatta* establishes peace with *Śakāra* in the *Mṛcchakaṭīka*.⁴⁷ Thus *Sāgra* is not in favour of presenting death scenes on the stage, where the death is unavoidable for the proper

delineation of the plot, it should be reported to in an Arthopokṣepaka, but should never be visibly represented.

Abhinavagupta himself forbids death scenes on the stage, but refers to and criticises views which permit such scenes. One such view draws a distinction between two types of deaths, one caused by others' activity, as the chopping up of the head of the demon with the disc (by Nārāyaṇa evidently), another happening independent of any such activity by diseases and hurts. The view advocates that the second may be shown on the stage while the first one is prohibited.⁴⁸ The reason seems to be the practical difficulty of representation and the intention of avoiding gruesome scenes. Abhinavagupta finds no reason behind the distinction drawn between the above two types of deaths. Moreover, from a practical standpoint as he argues, death scenes cannot be allowed on the stage, because the dead character neither can exit from nor can remain on the stage and thus creates many difficulties to the presentation itself and obstructs the development of Rasa. Abhinavagupta further adds that the *anubhāva maraṇa* may be represented in cases where the dead revives, as is the case of Jīmūtavāhana. Thus, according to Abhinavagupta visible representation of any sort of death without revival is totally forbidden on the stage. This is the opinion of all the later theorists, as shown before. But at the conclusion of the topic Abhinavagupta refers to another view that permits the visible representation of death on the stage in cases where death is due to the disease or hurts and where there is no necessity of revival or exit.⁴⁹ This view, in the face of Abhinavagupta's arguments, seems to suggest that death can be represented visibly either at the close of a play or an Act where there is a scope of covering the dead bodies with the curtain. It may be noted here that this principle appears to be generally followed in the plays ascribed to Bhāsa. The deaths of Daśaratha (*Pratimā*, Act. II), Vālin (*Abhiśeka*, Act. II) and Ariṣṭa (*Bālacarita*, Act. III) are depicted almost at the close of the Acts concerned, while that of Duryodhana (*Urubhaṅga*) is shown at the close of the play itself, as we

have it. Deaths of Cānūra, Muṣṭika and Kāṃsa (*Bāla-carita*) are depicted in the last Act and after that the play itself continues for a short while. It thus becomes certain that there were theorists and dramatists alike in ancient India who allowed death scenes on the stage.

The *Nāṭya-śāstra*, as has already been shown, totally prohibits the death of the main hero and general death scenes in an Aṅka. About death scenes it says : *pratyakṣāṇi tu nāṅke praveśakāḥ samvidheyāni*.⁵⁰ From this Dr M. M. Ghosh seems to conclude that the *Nāṭya-śāstra* allows visible representation of death in an Arthopakṣepaka, like the *Praveśaka* etc.⁵¹ Accepting this view it may be said that the *Nāṭya-śāstra* prohibits a detailed representation of death scenes as an Aṅka demands, but not their representation in a summary way in the *Praveśaka* or *Viṣkambhaka*. The standpoint of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* requires further elucidation. It draws up different lists of items prohibited on the stage. While describing various activities of women of superior and middling types it says :

*nāmbagrahaṇaṃ raṅge nā snānaṃ na vilepanaṃ |
nāñjanaṃ nāṅgarāgaśca keśa-saṃyamaṇaṃ tathā ||
nāprāvṛtā naikavastrā na rāgamadharasya tu |
uttamā madhyamā vāpi kurvīta pramadā kvacit ||*

Again in the same chapter *Nāṭya-śāstra* gives another list :
na kāryaṃ sayanaṃ raṅge nātyadharmāṃ vijānatā |

*yadvā śayītārthavaśād ekākī sahito 'pi vā |
cumbanālinganaṃ caiva tathā guhyaṃ ca yad bhavet ||
danta-cchedyaṃ nakha-cchedyaṃ nivi-bhramśanaṃ eva ca |
stanāntara-vimardanaṃ ca raṅga-madhye na kārayet ||
bhojanaṃ salila-kṛiḍā tathā lajjā-kāraṇaṃ ca yat |
evam vidhaṃ bhaved yad yat tat tat raṅge na kārayet ||
pitā-putra-snuṣā-śvaśrū-drīyaṃ yaśmāi tu nālakam |
tasmād etāni sarvāṇi varjanīyāni yatnataḥ ||*⁵³

A perusal of the above lists shows the high moral standard of the age and a keen practical sense of the sage. Through these injunctions it transpires that there was an idealistic atmosphere in ancient Indian stage ; decency and decorum were highly valued. Anything shameful or indecent was not

allowed on the stage. Presentation of grim realism was also not the aim of Sanskrit drama. In fact, grim realism has not been favoured in any form of ancient Indian art or literature. The above list is certainly not comprehensive. So, it is said in this connection that anything like these (*evam vidham bhaved yad yat*) and which are considered to be shameful (*lajjākaram ca yat*) should be avoided on the stage.⁵⁴ The taste of the people has been honoured as the best judge; the playwright and the Nātyācārya are to consider this fact in writing and producing a play. This seems to be the implication of the above injunctions. The *Nāṭya-śāstra* also puts before us a very practical reason behind these injunctions in *pitāputra-snuṣā* etc., (quoted above), and no better one can be conceived of even in modern age. A dramatic performance should avoid such representations as cannot be witnessed by a son with his father, mother and wife without any sense of shame due to some immodest acts on the stage. In practice also, we can point out that Bhavabhūti in the Act I of his *Uttara-rāmacarita* represents Sītā as sleeping and Rāma as supporting and affectionately caressing her. But none can allege that here the limit of modesty has been transgressed. The wife of Cārāyaṇa in the *Viddhaśālabhañjikā* sleeps on the stage, of course, alone.

The first list of injunctions in the chapter XXII (GOS), as quoted above, concerns with the acts of women of superior and mediocre types. Some activities by these types of women are not to be represented on the stage so that their grace and dignity may be fully maintained; and this is the implication of this list. It may be mentioned here that Kālidāsa allows *Śakuntalā* to be dressed and toileted at the eve of her journey to Hastināpura, by her friends in a serene and religious atmosphere prevailing on the stage. There is an important dramatic utility of this dressing and toileting of *Śakuntalā* which are to be witnessed by the audience for a proper comprehension of the repudiation scene in the next Act. Kālidāsa takes all possible cares to veil the beauty and identity of the heroine as known

to the hero and to save the latter from censure for which the curse of Durvāsas also has been introduced. Some may take objection to the wearing of the *kṣaumayugala* by Śakuntalā on the stage. But there are several means to obstruct the sight of the spectators on the stage. Moreover she can easily be dressed up with the silk cloths on the stage over her original bark-garment. In any case, it is the business of the director (Sūtradhāra) who is expected to be fully conversant with the taste and feeling of the audience, to look after how far and what is to be represented on the stage.

From what little has been said above, it is clear that the above two lists of prohibitions in the chapter XXII (GOS) of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* are purported to avoid in any type of *rūpaka* the visible representation of such acts which may wound the feeling of the audience and may cause any obstruction to the intended atmosphere on the stage as well as the development of proper Rasa. Such injunctions in the field of art depend upon socio-cultural inhibitions and none can give a comprehensive list of such inhibitions, as the taste and culture of the people differ from age to age even in the same country. The *Nāṭya-śāstra* also gives no comprehensive list. Here its injunctions appear to be words of caution addressed to the Sūtradhāra and the playwright concerning all types of plays (*rūpakas*).

In the light of the above, the prohibitive verse in the chapter XVIII of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* (quoted before) appear to refer only to such acts, a full-scale visible representation of which is forbidden in the *Aṅka* of a full-fledged drama, as the context shows. Regarding the visible representation of fighting, it may be pointed out, that *Nāṭya-śāstra* gives directions as to how the fighting is to be acted on the stage.⁵⁵ Similarly, the *Nāṭya-śāstra* elaborately discusses how death should be visibly represented on the stage and describes various symptoms to be imitated by characters representing deaths due to different causes like disease, hurt by weapons, snake-bites etc.⁵⁶ Abhinavagupta also refers to a school of thought that supports the visible representation of death

on the stage, as shown before. Thus neither the imitation of fighting nor that of death on the stage can be said to be totally forbidden in the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. The *Aṅka* is to represent scenes vividly and elaborately. The *Nāṭya-śāstra* seems to prohibit an elaborate and vivid representation of scenes depicting fights, death, loss of kingdom and seize of a city.⁵⁷ The context also shows that visible representation of such incidents as death etc., is forbidden mainly in *pūrṇa-sandhi-rūpakas* wherein also the *Praveśakas* may visibly represent fights etc., in a summary way. But, *Sāgara* is of opinion that such representation is totally forbidden, only the incidents are to be reported in the *Praveśakas*, as has been stated before. Regarding death scenes it may be pointed out here that excepting the works of *Bhāsa*, as noted before, not a single Sanskrit drama is known to us as depicting such a scene. In the Act II of the *Uttara-rāma-carita*, *Rāma* enters with his sword drawn and actually imitates striking *Śambuka* who is not on the stage, as the direction shows. But immediately *Śambuka* appears as a divine being (*divya-puruṣa*). Here even the visible representation of a fatal blow on the victim has been avoided. In practice then, visible representation of death scenes may be said to be avoided by Sanskrit dramatists. Later theorists mostly seem to have confused these different lists of injunctions and in their works we get a single list. In *Aṅkas* and *Arthopakṣepakas* alike, they totally prohibit the visible representation of all the scenes coming under the above injunctions of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, given in different chapters and in different contexts.⁵⁸ The *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* include even *vivāha* and *śāpotsarga* in this list of prohibited items.⁵⁹ All these according to them are to be reported, if required, in an *Arthopakṣepaka*. The narrow outlook of the latter works when compared with the *Nāṭya-śāstra* becomes evident. The variety of acts and incidents to be visibly represented on the stage came to be curtailed more and more.

III

Duration of Time Covered by an Aṅka

Regarding the duration of time that can be represented in an Act, the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* gives as many as three views. The first one is taken from the *Nāṭya-sāstra*. It says : *eka-divasa-pravṛttaḥ kāryo'ṅkaḥ sa prayogam adhikṛtya*.⁶⁰ Sāgara's gloss on it means to say that the entire plot should be so treated that an Aṅka can represent the matter of one day.⁶¹ Abhinavagupta also maintains that an Aṅka is to depict incidents that can take place in course of one day.⁶² This is the generally accepted view regarding the maximum duration of time that can be represented in an Aṅka.⁶³ But the incidents are to be so arranged that they may not create any hindrance to the routine duties⁶⁴ like *sandhyā-vandanādi*. This is mainly to serve the didactic purpose of dramatic performances. The suitable time is indicated through picturesque description of the morning, the noon and the evening and in every Sanskrit drama we come across one or more of such descriptions.

Sāgara refers to two other views. Some opine that incidents covering half of a day can be represented in an Aṅka, others maintain that an Aṅka can treat what may occur in a day and a night.⁶⁵ The *Bhāva-prakāśana* also refers to the first of these two views.⁶⁶ Śiṅgabhūpāla maintains that the duration of the entire day or its half is to be represented in an Aṅka.⁶⁷ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* offers a maximum and a minimum limit of the duration of time suitable to be represented in an Aṅka as four Yāmas and one Muhūrta respectively.⁶⁸

The problem as to how the passing of a long time in plays, generally based on the stories of the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata is to be distributed in Acts, has not been elaborately treated in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa*. Sāgara simply says that if the nature of the action involves a long passage of time in an Act. It should be reported in a Praveśaka following that Act. But in this way the maximum period of a

year should be treated and not more. Here Sāgara quotes in his support from the *Nāṭya-śāstra* : *varṣād ūrdhvam na kadācit*. In conclusion he says that this simply implies that events stretching over a very long period should not be represented in an Act.⁶⁹ It appears that Sāgara does not give much stress on the maximum period of a year. His opinion is simply that a long passage of time should not be represented in an Act.⁷⁰

The above problem has been elaborately discussed by Abhinavagupta.⁷¹ According to Abhinavagupta, from the long life of an epic hero a few years are to be selected for representation in a drama. Rāma though passed fourteen years in exile, yet there were only three or four such years, as full of incidents. Now the *Nāṭya-śāstra* enjoins that in an Aṅka incidents occurring in a single day can be represented and if these incidents are such as cannot be accommodated in the Aṅke, then the less important ones are to be summarily treated in a Praveśaka following that Aṅka.⁷² In the same way incidents occurring in course of a month or year can be represented in an Aṅka, followed by a Praveśaka or the like, but more than a year should not be treated in this way in a single Aṅka.⁷³ An Aṅka then in such cases, is to represent the most prominent incidents of the year as occurring in a single day of that year and the rest is to be dealt with in a short compass by the help of an Arthopakṣepaka. Thus the incidents of fourteen years of Rāma's exile or the like, should be so selected as to occur in, say, three or four years and can easily be represented in three or four Aṅkas in the above method. So, in a drama consisting of five Aṅkas, there can be represented at best five days having incidents (*kāryadināni*). Similarly in a drama of ten Aṅkas up to ten such days can be represented.⁷⁴ Thus, theoretically an Aṅka in a Sanskrit drama consists of a day's, incidents which are required and at the same time permissible to be visibly represented. This principle has also been followed by the dramatists of ancient India. An Act in a Sanskrit play never covers a duration of time exceeding a day. But it should be noted

that there is no injunction against the representation of events of one day in more than an Act.⁷⁵

IV

Other Regulations

Sāgara conclude the topic with the remark that neither one should enter in nor exit from the stage during the *Aṅka* without any purpose.⁷⁶ This may be taken to be a general principle for any play of any age. The entrance and exit of characters in either *Aṅka* or *Praveśaka* etc., should always be in connection with something relevant. Sāgara as has been shown, prohibits also the introduction of characters on the stage with an insignificant part to play, which purpose may very well be served by such devices as aerial voice, voice from behind the screen and *lekha*.⁷⁷

While describing the *Viṣkambhaka*, Sāgara quotes from the *Nāṭya-śāstra* :

*na mahājana-parivāraṃ kartavyaṃ nāṭakaṃ prakaraṇaṃ vā/
ye tatra kārya-puruṣāścatvaraḥ pañca vā te syuḥ*||⁷⁸

It appears that Sāgara takes this verse as containing a general injunction applicable to *Nāṭaka* and *Prakaraṇa*. The import of his gloss on the verse is that all the prominent associates of the hero and his enemy should not be presented on the stage with minor roles to play, only four or five from them should be made to involve directly in the main action and others are simply to be mentioned outside the main action.⁷⁹ What exactly Sāgara here drives at is not clear. If he means to assert that only four or five amongst the associates of the hero or his enemy are to be presented on the stage, then we can point out that in very few cases the principle has been followed.⁸⁰ On the other hand, if it means that a small number of characters should be made to involve directly in the main action and others indirectly, then it should be pointed out that the expression *bahireva* etc., is not a happy one. Viśvanātha, however, enjoins that there should be only four or five leading characters directly related to the action.⁸¹ According to

Abhinavagupta the implication of the above verse of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* is that a crowd should not be allowed on the stage, and undertakings which require many persons to be performed, should not be visibly represented. Abhinavagupta maintains that at best there can be eight to ten haracters present on the stage at a time. If the number exceeds much, then the scene will be no better than a crowd assembled to witness the *yātrā* of a deity and the four kinds of *abhinaya* will not be clearly perceptible.⁸² Thus, the verse according to Abhinavagupta refers to an Act and the above principle upheld by him has also found a general approval.⁸³ Like the presence of many characters on the stage at a time the representation of many incidents in a single Act has been normally prohibited for fear of shadowing the main topic. If for the sake of the plot many events are to be represented in a single Act, they should be so treated as not to hamper the necessary routine duties.⁸⁴

In describing the characteristics of Aṅka, Sāgara has missed a very important point which has been insisted upon by all other theorists of Indian dramaturgy and invariably followed by dramatists. As a rule, all characters should exit from the stage at the end of an Act.⁸⁵ During the Act according to Indian convention, the stage should never be left vacant and the exit of all characters and a temporary vacancy thus created on the stage, should mark the close of an Act. Now, the problem is what was the device employed in ancient India to represent this exit of characters. Abhinavagupta says that at the close of an Act the exit of all characters is to be shown by covering them with the *yavanikā* and the same is the opinion of Rāmacandra-Guṇacandra.⁸⁶ The existence of a screen in ancient Indian theatre is an undeniable fact but opinions vary as to the position of its setting. If the front curtain is meant here in this connection, the exit through the *yāvanikā* means covering the stage with the front curtain. If on the other hand, the back curtain is meant, then according to the above convention the actors and actresses at the end of an Act,

are to walk away of the stage behind the back screen.⁶⁷ In any case, a temporary vacancy on the stage created by the exit of all characters marks the close of an Act in a Sanskrit play. This convention is accepted both in theory and practice without any protest or violation.

V

Division of plays into several Acts is a very ancient practice in India as the evidences of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and the plays of Aśvaghōṣa, Bhāsa, Śūdraka and Kālidāsa show. It may be surmised that this practice evolved in India before the Europeans could divide their plays into Acts. Early Greek plays, we know, are not divided into Acts. But an Act in a Sanskrit drama is not further subdivided into scenes. Though it in itself forms an unity, it is not also a well marked scene in the modern sense of the term. On the other hand, an Act in most of our renowned dramas consists of a number of scenes, loosely connected but cannot be separated from one another due to its peculiar technique of construction and representation. In the Act III of the *Abhijñāna-śakuntala*, the king enters and proceeds towards the bower on the bank of the Mālīnī where he reaches after going a few steps only. Almost all the Acts of the *Mṛcchakatikā* consist of a number of scenes. This salient feature of Sanskrit drama can be noticed by any casual reader. A peculiar technique of representation also evolved in India. The stage was taken to be divided into several *kakṣyās*⁸⁸ and with the help of the proper arrangement of miniature models (*pusta*),⁸⁹ illusion of adjoining spots could be created and the characters were made to move from one spot to another according to necessity during acting. Moreover, the peculiar construction of a Sanskrit drama teeming with poetic descriptions of time and place and their reactions on the minds of characters together with the skilled performances of four types of *abhinaya* also contributed very much in the creation of dramatic illusion. The passage of time and the shifting of scenes in an Act are simply described in Sanskrit plays.

Indian dramatic convention shows no trace of the three unities maintained in some of the Greek plays. Sanskrit drama as a whole, maintains no unity of time, place or action, but adheres to uniformity. Even in an Act the unity of place is ignored in most cases, as has been stated above. But, an Act being an unit in itself should maintain some sort of unity. It is also an accepted fact that individual Acts were also played⁹⁰ and which could not have been possible had there been no unity in an Act. It has been shown before that the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, as interpreted by Sāgara and Abhinava, enjoins that a particular incident requires to be fully delineated in an Act.⁹¹ This principle has been emphasised again in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* where Sāgara enjoins that in an Act, the behaviour of a particular leading character should be visibly represented.⁹² From this it appears that a sort of unity of action is prescribed to be maintained. Several views have been discussed regarding the duration of time to be represented in an Act and it has been shown that all the theorists are of opinion that a certain unit of time, generally a day, is to be covered by an Act. Generally speaking then, according to Indian theorists, an Act is to represent fully a particular incident forming an important part of the whole plot and occurring in a particular unit of time. There should not be any appreciable break within the Act, as the convention of the close of an Act through the exit of all characters shows. The *Daśa-rūpaka* nicely puts this in a short compass, *ekāhacaritaiikārtham*.⁹³

The untenability of the theory of the dependence of Acts on the Avasthā-Sandhi, as advocated by Abhinava-gupta and others; has also been shown. It has been shown above that an Aṅka maintains an unity of time and action. But no such unity is essential in an Avasthā. The first Avasthā of the *Abhijñāna-śakuntala* according to Rāghava-bhaṭṭa as shown before, represents incidents occurring in different days. No unity of action or time is tracable in the Acts IV, V, VI and part of VII of the *Abhijñāna-śakuntala* though they have been taken to be included in

the Vimarśa Sandhi by Viśvanātha.⁹⁴ It is useless to multiply instances. It should be pointed out here that the plot of a full fledged drama can be analysed and divided for different purposes and from different standpoints but, a simplification of those into a clear-cut mould is practically impossible. Acts and Avasthās serve quite different purposes and are determined according to different standpoints. The point has already been discussed. One may correspond to the other, but not necessarily. If Avasthās and Acts are so correlated, as taken by Abhinavagupta then it is difficult to find out the reason behind the two sets of terminology, while the ancient theorists are famous for their love of brevity in expressions. It is interesting to note here that in Europe also there was a time when the principle of the five-fold natural divisions of a dramatic plot based on the normal division of a Greek Tragedy influenced playwrights so much that they divided their plays into five Acts. But this wooden structure could not be maintained for a long time.

CHAPTER XIX

ARTHOPAKṢEPAKAS

1. Praveśaka

The purpose served by the Praveśaka in a Sanskrit drama has been indicated in our foregoing discussion on the Aṅka. Praveśaka is to epitomize the portions of the story which are not possible or permissible to be elaborately and visibly represented in an Act, but at the sametime should be conveyed to the audience for proper comprehension of the action. Drama is always a representation of selections. The entire history of a hero covering a long time can not be fully represented in a drama. An Act also, according to Indian convention can cover only a day, as shown before. So, the important and impressive events of a long period are so selected as occurring on some particular days, and are visibly represented in Acts. But to maintain the link of the whole story, the scattered portions omitted in Acts, are drawn together and briefly dealt with in the Praveśaka. This is the opinion of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* as understood by *Sāgara*¹ and Abhinavagupta. Later theorists also generally accept this view. But the above function of the Praveśaka is thought to be commonly shared by all the Arthopakṣepakas, specially by the Viṣkambhaka. Abhinavagupta, therefore, takes the word Praveśaka of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* in the above context to stand for all the Arthopakṣepakas.²

In the form of a popular etymology, Sāgara gives his opinion regarding the function of the Praveśaka. He says that the Praveśaka is so called because it introduces characters on the stage, *praveśayati pātrāṇi raṅgam iti prav-eśakaḥ*.³ He further states that the entrance of the immediately following character should be mentioned in the Praveśaka, and to justify this statement he quotes from an anonymous authority: *asūcīlasya pātrasya praveśo naiva vidyate*,⁴ i.e., no character should enter the stage without being indicated. The entire verse with slight difference in

reading is found in the *Saṅgīta-dāmodara*, in Raṅganātha's commentary on the *Vikramorvaśīya* and also in the commentary on *Anargha-rāghava* by Rucipati who in two cases attributes the verse to Bharata and in another to the *Saṅgītakalpataru*⁵. Raṅganātha ascribes the verse to the commentary on the *Daśa-rūpaka* by Devapāni and says that the view is also shared by the *Sāhasāṅkiya-ṭikā*⁶. The above half of the verse given by Sāgara, is found in the commentary of Narahari on the *Abhijñāna-śakuntala* and also in the *Arthadyotanikā* of Rāghava-bhaṭṭa with a different reading and under different context⁷.

Neither the *Nāṭya-śāstra* nor Abhinava-gupta directly prohibits the entrance of a character without being indicated. Standard works like the *Daśa-rūpaka*, *Bhāva-prakāśana*, *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* and *Sāhitya-darpaṇa*, also do not refer to this view. Dramatists, however, generally follow this principle. Some renowned commentators and a late work like the *Saṅgīta-dāmodara*, as noted above, honour the principle. The *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*, so far as the extant works are concerned, is the earliest one to refer to this view. Sāgara seems to have taken the line from some ancient source⁸, probably the work of Mātṛgupta whom he honours so much. Rāghava-bhaṭṭa does not connect the view with the function of the Praveśaka, but Raṅganātha, Rucipati, Narahari and Śubhaṅkara refer to the view in connection with the Praveśaka or Viṣkambhaka.⁹ They strongly assert that the main function of the Praveśaka (or Viṣkambhaka) is to give prior indication to the entrance of a leading character.¹⁰ It thus appears that this principle got a wide recognition and among the theorists Sāgara is first to cite it as an ancient view.

To show other uses of the Praveśaka Sāgara quotes from the *Nāṭya-śāstra* :

kālotthāna-gati-rasa-vyudāsārambha-kārya-viṣayāṇām /
*arthābhīdhānabhūtaḥ praveśakaḥ syād anekārthaḥ ||*¹¹

According to the gloss of Sāgara, this verse means that the Praveśaka serves many purposes: it communicates the reckoning of time of a distant journey and causes the

change of Rasa and thus provides variety in the performance.¹² Abhinavagupta maintains that the above verse mentions five uses of the Praveśaka of which he gives examples and adds that there are other uses also.¹³

Regarding the characters to take part in a Praveśaka and the language to be used by them, Sāgara quotes from the *Nāṭya-śāstra* :

*nottama-madhyama-puruṣairācarito nāpyudātta-vacana-
kṛtaḥ /
prākṛta-bhāṣācāraḥ prayogam āsādyā kartavyaḥ* //¹⁴

Thus in a Praveśaka, (a) no superior or middling character but only low ones are to take part, (b) there should be no *udātta-vacana* and (c) only Prākṛta is to be used. Sāgara gives no meaning of the word *udātta-vacana* but, for illustration refers to the *Śakṭyaṅka* where two monkeys take part in a Praveśaka, and then remarks : *tadevā nodātta vacanaṃ tadeva prākṛta-bhāṣācāram*.¹⁵ It is evident that *udātta-vacana* has not been taken by Sāgara to mean Sanskrit language. But Abhinava-gupta distinctly says : *udāttaṃ saṃskṛtaṃ vacanaṃ tasya niṣedhaḥ*.¹⁶ So, according to Abhinava-gupta only *nīca-pātras* should take part in a Praveśaka and not Sanskrit but only Prākṛta should be their language. Dhanañjaya also seems to prohibit the use of Sanskrit in the Praveśaka when he uses *anudāttokṛtyā* in its definition which has simply been copied by Viśvanātha.¹⁷ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* and *Rasāṃga-sudhākara* also allow only *nīca-pātra* in a Praveśaka and as such, Sanskrit becomes prohibited.¹⁸ Bhoja also maintains that Śaurasenī etc., should be the language in a Praveśaka.¹⁹

Sāgara maintains quite a different view. From the *Nāṭya-śāstra* he quotes : *parijanakathānubaddhaḥ praveśako nāma vijñeyah*²⁰, i.e., Praveśaka consists of dialogues of servants or retinue. In his gloss Sāgara includes in the term *parijana* such lower and middling characters as male and female slaves, chamberlains and the like.²¹ Thus the Kañcukin (chamberlain), a Sanskrit-speaking *madhyama-pātra*, has been included among the characters to take part in a Praveśaka. Abhinava-gupta, however, interprets the above hemistich of the *Nāṭya-*

śāstra to refer to all the Arthopakṣepakas and maintains that the Kañcukin may appear in a Viṣkambhaka²²; i.e. the Kañcukin or any *madhyama-pātra* has been excluded from the Praveśaka.

In support of his above theory Sāgara quotes the view of Mātṛgupta that permits parasites, (Viṣas) ascetics, Brahmins, sages and chamberlains etc., to take part in a Praveśaka.²³ These are all Sanskrit-speaking characters. Again, at the conclusion of his gloss on the verse *kāloṭhānagati* etc., of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* (quoted before), Sāgara means to state that the only additional characteristic is to be added to the view of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* is the use of Sanskrit when ascetics etc., take part in a Praveśaka.²⁴ Illustrations of Praveśakas with Sanskrit-speaking characters have been cited from third Acts of the *Raivātīpariṇaya*, *Śaśikāmadattā* and the *Abhijñāna-śakuntala*.²⁵ But, the interlude at the beginning of the Act III of the *Abhijñāna-śakuntala* is noted as a Viṣkambhaka and not Praveśaka in printed texts and that is also the opinion of Rāghava-bhaṭṭa.²⁶ It is a Viṣkambhaka in the opinion of all the theorists who do not follow the above principle of Mātṛgupta, as here the disciple of the sage Kaṇva performs the interlude in Sanskrit language. The encyclopaedic *Bhāva-prakāśana* records the above view of Mātṛgupta though his name has not been mentioned, and here we get the full verse,²⁷ half of which is found in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*. Among the commentators, two from Mithilā, Śaṅkara and Narahari quote the entire verse in their commentaries on the *Abhijñāna-śakuntala*²⁸ and the readings there correspond exactly with that adopted by Sāgara. It is all the more interesting to note here that Śaṅkara attributes the verse to one *mahārāja*. Śaṅkara, perhaps believed that Mātṛgupta of Kalhana's *Rājataranginī*, who was a king and poet,²⁹ was also the author of a treatise on dramaturgy. After all, it is evident that there was a theory according to which middling characters like parasites, ascetics, chamberlains etc., all speaking Sanskrit, could take part in the Praveśaka. Perhaps Mātṛgupta was the propounder of this theory, at least his name as the earliest supporter of the theory is recorded by Sāgara.

Sāgara quotes the view of another anonymous authority according to which the Praveśaka should be subservient to what follows,³⁰ and as an illustration of this characteristic, cites the Praveśaka in the Act III of the *Veṇī-saṃhāra*. The dialogues there between a *rākṣasa* couple though in Prākṛta, has been mentioned as *udātta-vacana* by Sāgara.³¹ It has been shown before that following the *Nāṭya-śāstra* Sāgara prohibits *udātta-vacana* in a Praveśaka and also does not take it to mean Sanskrit language, as done by Abhinava. But here, while recording the view of another authority, he permits *udātta-vacana*, though he maintains silence regarding the implication of the word. Abhinavagupta refers to a view that understands *udātta-vacana* as : *svātmā-kārya-viśrānta-vacana*. Thus, according to this view, in a Praveśaka such speeches as refer to the affairs of those who take part in it, are prohibited³² ; i.e., in a Praveśaka, the dialogues, of course in Prākṛta, should be related to the affairs of the main characters, the hero, heroine etc. In the above illustration of Praveśaka from the *Veṇī-saṃhāra* Sāgara cites the speech of the *rākṣasa* : "Out of his wrath against the son of Drupada, he (Aśvatthāman) may kill us also" as *udātta-vacana*.³⁴ The speech here gives a sequel of the main story (*prakrama*) by its reference to the wrath of Aśvatthāman who enters immediately with an unsheathed sword in his hand, and also is related to the safety of the characters present here. Thus it appears that Sāgara also takes *udātta-vacana* to mean speeches related to the affairs of characters themselves.³⁵

The Praveśaka maintains Sāgara, is to be used in between two Acts and there too, at the beginning of an Act and never in the middle or end.³⁶ It thus follows that a Praveśaka should not occur at the beginning of the Act I of a play. Dhanañjaya, Viśvanātha and Śiṅgabhūpāla state this convention more explicitly.³⁷ But the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* maintains that this is the opinion of some theorists, some do not allow a Praveśaka at the beginning of the first Act.³⁸ Śārādātānaya also says that generally the Praveśaka is prohibited at the beginning of the first Act.³⁹ Abhinava-

gupta also maintains that the Praveśaka is to be used in between two Acts.⁴⁰ From the standpoint of Sāgara it may be argued that as the Praveśaka is to introduce the *pātra* of the following Act, it should be used at the beginning of that Act, and because in the Act I of a drama the *pātra* is introduced by the Sūtradhāra (or Sthāpaka) in the Prastāvana, the Praveśaka is of no use there.

As a brief *re'sume'* of the entire discussion the following may be stated :

- (1) Indian theorists agree that the Praveśaka is to epitomize the scattered portions of the story which are not possible or permissible to be elaborately represented in Aṅkas.
- (2) The *Nāṭya-śāstra* as we have it, prohibits *udātta-vacana* and higher characters in the Praveśaka and prescribes only Prākṛta language there. This is also the generally accepted view.
- (3) Māṭṛgupta admits Sanskrit language and such characters as Viṭa, Tāpasa, Vipra, Kañcukin etc., in a Praveśaka. Sāgara, Śāradātanaya and two commentators from Mithila accept this view.
- (4) All the theorists agree that the Praveśaka should not be used at the beginning of the first Act, but from the evidences of the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* and *Bhāva-prakāśana* it appears that there were some who had no objection against the use of Praveśaka at the beginning of the first Act.
- (5) According to some, as recorded in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kosa*, even *udātta-vacana* is permissible in a Praveśaka where it is *prakramādhina*. Sāgara takes the word in a sense which has been referred to by Abhinavagupta to be the opinion of some.
- (6) No character should enter the stage without prior indication. This is a generally accepted theory in practice, though not expressed by any one excepting Sāgara. Śubhaṅkara and some commentators who also maintain that the Praveśaka serves to give the

prior indication of the entrance of a leading character in the immediately following Act.

In conclusion, it may be pointed out that neither any one of the *niṣedhas* nor the *vidhi* of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* regarding the Praveśaka as enumerated (in 2) above, is thought to be absolute by all the theorists. It may be added here that according to the *Viṣṇu-dharmottara-purāṇa*, two characters are to take part in a Praveśaka.⁴¹ This *purāṇic* injunction is but a general statement of facts, as Praveśakas are generally found to be performed by two characters, though instances of Praveśakas with only one character are not wanting. The one at the beginning of the Act II of the *Svapna-vāsavadatta* may be cited here, as an example.

II. Viṣkambhaka (Viṣkambha)

All the editions of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* describe the Viṣkambhaka twice each. The GOS. edition of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* in the chap. XVIII, while describing the Prakaraṇa says :¹

- (1) *madhyama puruṣairnityam yojyo viṣkambhako'tratat-tvajñāṣṭi/ saṃskṛtavacanānugataḥ saṃkṣepārthaḥ praveśakavat/*
- (2) *suddhaḥ saṃkīrṇo vā dvividho viṣkambhako 'pi kartavyaḥ/mādhyamapātraḥ suddhaḥ saṃkīrṇo nīcamadhyamakṛtaḥ/*

The KSS. and KM. editions here read another verse :²

- (3) *anikāntare mukhe vā prakaraṇam āsṛitya nātaka vāpi/ viṣkambhakastu niyataḥ kartavyo madhyamairadhamaiḥ/*

Again in the chapter XIX of the GOS. edition, we get a similar description of the Viṣkambhaka :³

- (1) *madhyama-puruṣa-niyojyo nātaka-mukhasandhi-mātra-saṃcāraḥ/viṣkambhakastu kāryaḥ purohitāmāya-kañcukibhiḥ/*
- (2) *suddhaḥ saṃkīrṇo vā dvividho viṣkambhakastu vijñe-yah/mādhyama-pātraiḥ suddhaḥ saṃkīrṇo nīcamadhyama-kṛtaḥ/*

The commentary of Abhinava-gupta on these two verses of the chapter XIX is not available. On the otherhand, the first one of these two verses is attributed to Kohala by Abhinavagupta⁴ and the second one is a copy of the second verse quoted above from the chapter XVIII. Thus these two verses appear to be interpolations, as stated by the editor.⁵ The verse, attributed to Kohala by Abhinavagupta is also not very unsimilar to the first verse quoted above from the chapter XVIII. Thus, the authenticity of almost the entire definition of the Viṣkambhaka becomes questionable. However, according to the *Nāṭya-śāstra* as it stands now :

- (a) Viṣkambhaka serves the same purpose as the Praveśaka. Like Praveśaka it is also used to convey to the audience in a summary way those events of the plot which are not represented in Act. Viṣkambhaka is *sāṃkṣepārtha* like the Praveśaka (*praveśakavat*).
- (b) A Viṣkambhaka may be either *śuddha* or *saṃkirṇa*. In a Śuddha-viṣkambhaka, only Sanskrit is to be used by a *madhyama* character or characters ; while in a Saṃkirṇa-viṣkambhaka, there should be both Sanskrit and Prakrit-speaking characters (*nīca-madhyama-pātra*).

Thus the use of Sanskrit is the only mark that distinguishes a Viṣkambhaka from a Praveśaka where only Prakrit is to be used.^{6a} It is also clear from the above that the *Nāṭya-śāstra* recognises Praveśaka along with the Aṅka, as the main device of representation and Viṣkambhaka is considered as nothing but Praveśaka with the use of Sanskrit. Abhinava-gupta also takes the word Praveśaka of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* in several places, as shown before, to stand for the five Arthopakṣepakas and also for Viṣkambhaka.⁶ But in other later works, excepting the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* and *Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa*⁷, Viṣkambhaka is found to be defined first and the definition of the Praveśaka comes as an *atideśa*. These later authorities, however, follow the *Nāṭya-śāstra* closely, so far as the nature and function of the Viṣkambhaka and Praveśaka are concerned.⁸

Following the *Nāṭya-śāstra* Sāgara also admits that the Viṣkambhaka does not differ materially from the Praveśaka, it is *praveśakasthānīya*⁹, and is of two kinds *śuddha* and *saṃkīrṇa*. Only Sanskrit is to be used in the Śuddha-viṣkambhaka; if an inferior character, speaking Prakrit is also involved, it is Saṃkīrṇa-viṣkambhaka.¹⁰ But it has been shown that Sāgara following Mātṛgupta permits Sanskrit-speaking *madhyama* characters to take part in a Praveśaka and as such, the use of Sanskrit or the participation of a *madhyama* character cannot be the mark to distinguish a Viṣkambhaka from a Praveśaka. To show the distinction between the two, Sāgara quotes from an anonymous source and adds his comment :

*kuto 'pi svevchayā prāptaḥ sambaddho nobhayorapi/
viṣkambhakaḥ vijñeyāḥ kathārthasyāpi sūcakaḥ|| kuto 'pi hetoḥ
svayam evāgataḥ/sambaddho nobhayorapi nāyaka-tadvipakṣa-
yorapi na pratibaddhaḥ||*¹¹

The above verse occurs also in the *Bhāva-prakāśana* and *Saṅgita-dāmodara*.¹² Among the commentators Rucipati and Jagadhara quote the verse and ascribe it to Bharata. Śaṅkara also quotes it but gives no name of the source.¹³ Rucipati further says : *viṣkambhako nāma pātrabhedah*. This gives a clear hint to the implication of the above verse and Sāgara's comment thereon. A Viṣkambhaka is to be carried on by a character or characters who should not be directly connected with the hero or his enemy. The particular type of character thus involved, is to enter the stage out of his own accord and should indicate relevant matters of the plot.

Sāgara tries to give an etymology of the word and says that a Viṣkambhaka is so called as it supports (the progress of the action) out of joy.¹⁴ Dr Raghavan remarks, "It is usual to interpret Viṣkambhaka on the basis of the meaning, the supporting thing, its relation to exhilaration mentioned by the NLRK. is original, but not universally applicable."¹⁵ Sāgara also does not claim it to be so. Abhinavagupta says : *viṣkambhayatyupastambhayatīti viṣkambhakaḥ*, and this sense has been made more clear in the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* when

it says that the Viṣkambhaka supports the action by linking (the scattered portions of the story).¹⁶

From the above discussion, it appears that Sāgara admits of no essential distinction between the Viṣkambhaka and Praveśaka. In common with other theorists he maintains that there should be at least one Sanskrit speaking *madhyamapātra* in a Viṣkambhaka. But neither Sanskrit speech nor *madhyamapātra* is prohibited in a Praveśaka according to the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*. A Praveśaka maintains Sāgara, indicates the entrance of the next leading character and this seems to be the only distinguishing feature of a Praveśaka over Viṣkambhaka in his opinion.

It has been shown before that with other theorists Sāgara also do not admit the use of Praveśaka at the beginning of the first Act of a drama, though the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* refers to the view as maintained by some. As to the position of the Viṣkambhaka, Sāgara maintains silence and this may be explained as his consent to its use either between two Acts or at the beginning of the first Act. Abhinava-gupta informs us that Kohala favours the use of the Viṣkambhaka at the beginning of the first Act only and this is corroborated by Rāmacandra-Guṇacandra, while Śāra-dātanaya attributes the view to Bhoja.¹⁷ Abhinava-gupta himself maintains that unlike the Praveśaka, the Viṣkambhaka may be used at the beginning of the first Act, but this does not mean that it should not be used between two Acts; i.e., it may be used between two Acts and also between the Prastāvanā and the first Act.¹⁸ This is also the generally accepted convention.¹⁹

Dr. M. M. Ghosh observes, "First it (Viṣkambhaka) related to the Nāṭaka" and that perhaps in a later stage of the development of Indian drama, it came to be related to the Prakaraṇa also.²⁰ But the *Nāṭya-śāstra* (GOS XVIII) defines the Viṣkambhaka while describing the Prakaraṇa and the definition found in the chap. XIX (GOS) has been suspected to be interpolation. Bhoja clearly states that the Viṣkambhaka, serving the purpose of the Praveśaka, is to be used here in the Prakaraṇa, and Sanskrit speaking

madhyama-pātras are to take part in it.^{20a} Abhinava-gupta also maintains that the Viṣkambhaka is much more useful in a Prakaraṇa which contains a large number of middling characters.²¹ This makes the very reverse of Dr M. M. Ghosh's above observation more probable. The *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kōśa* gives the view of Cārāyaṇa who favours the use of Viṣkambhaka in Nāṭaka and Prakaraṇa alike.²² But in another place while describing the Prakaraṇa Sāgara asserts that Viṣkambhaka is obligatory in Prakaraṇa.^{22a} The KM. and KSS. editions of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* read a verse : *āṅkāntare mukhevā* etc. as quoted above,²³ that restricts the use of Viṣkambhaka in Nāṭaka and Prakaraṇa only. Another verse, that occurs in all the editions of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* clearly states : *prakaraṇa-nāṭaka-viśaye praveśakaḥ sam-vidhātavyaḥ*. Abhinavagupta in his commentary on this verse says that the scope of the theme in *rūpakas* other than the Nāṭaka and Prakaraṇa is limited, so, the Praveśaka is not a necessity there.²⁴ Here Praveśaka undoubtedly stands also for the Viṣkambhaka. For the same reason the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* restricts the use of the two in Nāṭaka, Prakaraṇa, Nāṭikā and Prakaraṇī :²⁵ the last two types of plays are later developments in the model of the first two respectively. It thus appears that according to the established principle of dramaturgy, the use of Praveśaka and Viṣkambhaka is recommended in Nāṭaka and Prakaraṇa alike for the representation of complicated plots. This principle, as shown above, is also supported by the canons of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.²⁶

III. Āṅkāvatāra (Garbhāṅka)

There has been a longstanding confusion regarding the nature and utility of Āṅkāvatāra and Āṅkamukha. The introduction of other two terms Garbhāṅka and Āṅkāśya by some theorists has made the problem more complicated. Sāgara, however, takes no note of these two terms and explains only Āṅkāvatāra and Āṅkamukha.

Aṅkāvatāra, says Sāgara, is the transition of an Act, *aṅkasyāvataranam*,¹ and then quotes the following definition from an anonymous source ;

*samāpyamāna ekasminnanke hyanyasya sūcanam/
samāsato hi nātyoktaiḥ (nātyajñaiḥ or nātyoktyā ?) so' aṅkāvat-
āra iṣyate.*²||

The confused text of the *Bhāva-prakāśana* gives, with a minor difference in reading, this definition of the Aṅkāvatāra³ along with the other definition of the same from the *Daśa-rūpaka*. Jagaddhara in his commentary on the *Mālati-mādhava* quotes this definition of the Aṅkāvatāra.⁴ Dr Raghavan informs us that the above verse is quoted by Bahurūpa Miśra in his commentary of the *Daśa-rūpaka* and is ascribed to the Dvādasasāhasrī.⁵ According to the above view, Aṅkāvatāra is the indication of the next Act by means of short (dramatic or cryptic) speech at the end of the preceding Act. Sāgara illustrates this Aṅkāvatāra by the closing verse of the Act I of the *Nāgānanda*. The hero of the drama here in this verse, describes the plight of an elephant due to the scorching heat of the mid-day sun and Sāgara means to say that this indicates the representation of the longing of the hero for the heroine in the next Act.⁶ It may be noted here that the Act II depicts the longing of both the hero and heroine for each other. It thus appears that Aṅkāvatāra, according to this view, is the dramatic fore-shadowing of the events of the next Act, at the end of the preceding Act. Jagaddhara also takes it in this sense as appears from the context and his comment.⁷ It is important to note here that there is a Praveśaka between Acts I and II of the *Nāgānanda*. Similarly a Viṣkambhaka intervenes between the Acts VIII and IX of the *Mālati-mādhava*. Thus it appears that the above view on Aṅkāvatāra admits the intervention of an interlude between the two Acts concerned. But this is opposed by the *Daśa-rūpaka* and its followers, as will be shown. It is curious that Viśvanātha practically follows the *Daśa-rūpaka* in defining the Aṅkāvatāra but, for illustration cites the transition of the Act VI from the Act V of the *Abhijñāna-sakuntala*, and between these two Acts there is also

a Praveśaka ; the fisherman scene.⁸ Dr K. K. Datta Sastri informs us "The Bengal recension of the drama, however, deems it (the Praveśaka) as a part and parcel of the fifth Act and gives it the designation *Aṅkāvatāra*." The said scholar also shows reasons and justifies the standpoint of the Bengal recension in designating the fisherman scene itself as an *Aṅkāvatāra* instead of Praveśaka.⁹ But the theorists, as shown above, do not maintain that the interlude itself is the *Aṅkāvatāra*. Thus, according to the school of thought followed by Sāgara, *Aṅkāvatāra* consists in prior indication to the events of the next Act at the close of the preceding Act, and there may be the intervention of an interlude between the Acts concerned.

According to the *Daśa-rūpaka* as interpreted by Dhanika, that is the case of *Aṅkāvatāra* when without any intervention of a *Viṣkambhaka* and Praveśaka, the next Act commences as a continuation of the preceding one being just hinted at by some dramatic personae,¹⁰ evidently at the close of the preceding Act. For illustration, Dhanika cites the passing of the first Act to the second in the *Mālavikāgnimitra*.¹¹ This is the generally accepted view regarding the *Aṅkāvatāra*. The *Bhāva-Prakāśana* in its usual way, reproduces the above definition and illustration from the *Daśa-rūpaka* along with the other definition, as stated before.¹² The *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* also gives a similar definition of the *Aṅkāvatāra*,¹³ though the illustration cited goes to support the view of Sāgara, as pointed out before. Vidyānātha endorses the view of Dhanañjaya.¹⁴ Śiṅga-bhūpāla cites the same illustration as in the *Avaloka* and seems to follow the *Daśa-rūpaka* when he defines the *Aṅkāvatāra* as, where all the characters of the preceding Act enter the next Act to represent the continuation of the same event.¹⁵ Rūpa Gosvāmin reproduces this definition of the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* with a minor modification.¹⁶ Thus, according to this group of theorists headed by Dhanañjaya, *Aṅkāvatāra* is the device for passing from one Act to another without any intervention of an interlude.

From the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and *Abhinava-bhārati* we get at least three more or less similar but confusing definitions of the *Aṅkāvatāra*. The GOS. version in chapter XIX defines it as :

*aṅkānta eva cāṅka nīpatati yasmin prayogam āśādyā/
bījārtha-yukto-yukto jñeyo hyaṅkāvatāro 'sau*||¹⁷

But the commentary of Abhinavagupta on this verse is not found. In another place, however, Abhinava-gupta gives almost an identical definition of the *Aṅkāvatāra* and seems to regard the same as from the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.¹⁸ According to this definition, when in practice an Act comes immediately after the close of another and is related to the central theme, it is *Aṅkāvatāra*. The incident represented in the preceding Act, directly continues to the following Act, as Abhinavagupta seems to understand it.¹⁹ This is exactly what the *Daśa-rūpaka* says about *Aṅkāvatāra* more clearly. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* also gives a similar definition of the *Aṅkāvatāra* and cited the same illustration as in the *Avaloka*.²⁰

“That there was further confusion”, regarding the *Aṅkāvatāra* is evident not from the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* alone, as informs Dr Raghavan,²¹ but from the *Abhinava-bhārati* itself which the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* follows. The name of the *Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa* also cannot be omitted as the source of the confusion noticed in the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa*. Abhinava-gupta informs us that Kohala defines *Aṅkāvatāra*, a kind of *Aṅka* as ; *aṅkasyāṅkāntare yogastvatātāraḥ prakīrtitaḥ*²² i.e., when one Act is directly connected with the other, it is *Aṅkāvatāra*. This *Aṅkāvatāra* of Kohala appears to be the same as that of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, as discussed before. Abhinava-gupta himself, on the other hand, says that when in an Act the central theme of all other Acts, i.e., the *Bīja* is introduced, it is called *Avatārāṅka*. The illustration is cited from the Act II of the *Ratnāvalī* where *Susaṅgatā* in appreciation of *Sāgarikā*’s love for the king remarks “Such a bride should desire such a groom”.²³ It is apparent that Abhinava-gupta here gives practically a separate definition of the *Avatārāṅka* than that is given by Kohala whose view he himself quotes. Now this *Avatārāṅka* of Abhinavagupta is nothing but *Aṅkāvatāra* and thus we get two definitions of the same from Abhinava-gupta himself :

- (1) Passing from one Act to another without any break; this is the most common view, supported by the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and is held by Kohala, Dhanañjaya and others.
- (2) Introduction of the central theme of all other Acts in one Act,—first found in the *Abhinava-bhārati*.

The encyclopaedic text of Bhoja's *Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa* is much more confusing. In one place in the chapter XI it describes Praveśaka, Viśkambhaka, Aṅka-mukha, Garbhāṅka and Cūlikā, but omits Aṅkāvatāra.²⁴ Here the Garbhāṅka has been described as :

*aṅkāntare parāṅko nīpatati yasmin prayogam āsādyā/
bījārtha-yukti-yukto garbhāṅko nāma sa jñeyah||*

This Garbhāṅka of Bhoja is the Aṅkāvatāra of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and *Abhinava-bhārati*.²⁵ In another place we find that the name of the Aṅkamukha is missing and Aṅkāvatāra is included and thus the number five is not disturbed.²⁶ Again in the same chapter we find another description of Garbhāṅka, where it has been stated to be a synonym of Aṅkāvatāra²⁷ :

*bījārtha-yukti-mān aṅko yo'ṅkeṣvekaṁ prayujyate/
sa nātakeṣu garbhāṅko 'aṅkāvatāraśca kathyate||*

According to this view, among the Acts the one which is *bījārthayukti-mān* (containing the introduction of the central theme, i.e. the Bīja) is called the Garbhāṅka or Aṅkāvatāra. This definition of Garbhāṅka-Aṅkāvatāra is offered in another words by Abhinava-gupta as that of Avatārāṅka.²⁸ Bhoja, as it appears from the above, gives two separate definitions : one of the Garbhāṅka and the other of the both Garbhāṅka and Aṅkāvatāra. The Aṅkāvatāra of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and others has been taken as the Garbhāṅka, and the Avatārāṅka of Abhinava-gupta has been recognised as Garbhāṅka or Aṅkāvatāra. Śāradātanaya also seems to understand Garbhāṅka as another name of the Aṅkāvatāra, but it has been pointed out before that he records both the views, one held by Sāgara and the other found in the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, *Dāśa-rūpaka* etc. We are not sure with what Aṅkāvatāra Śāradātanaya identifies the Garbhāṅka.

The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* first sets forth the most common view on *Aṅkāvatāra*³⁰ and then practically in the words of Abhinava-gupta records his view on *Avatārāṅka* as being the definition of *Aṅkāvatāra* according to some. The same illustration as found in the *Abhinava-bhāratī* has also been cited,³¹ and then is stated :

ayam ca garbhāṅko 'pyucyate/yadāhuh :

āṅkāntareva cāṅko nipatati yasmin prayogam āsādyā/

*bījārtha-yukti-yukto garbhāṅko nāma vijñeyah// iti*³²

This verse is undoubtedly the same as found in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* as the definition of the *Aṅkāvatāra*. But the slight changes in readings of underlined words here have completely changed the meaning of the verse. The verse, as it is, means that when an *Aṅka* comes within another *Aṅka*, it is called *Garbhāṅka*. But this does not appear to be the intended meaning of the authors, as the verse has been cited to support the view that *Garbhāṅka* is *Aṅkāvatāra*. None of the two definitions of *Aṅkāvatāra*, given before by themselves can be taken as fully identical with this definition of *Garbhāṅka*. It is not also clear which one of two *Aṅkāvatāras* according to two different views is intended to be referred to by the pronoun *ayam*. Most probably the *Aṅkāvatāra* according to the common view is meant here by *ayam* and Dr. K. K. Datta Shastri rightly opines that this form of *Garbhāṅka* is obviously based on a doubtful version of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, available to the authors of the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa*.³³

In practice also, we find that the introduction of some sort of a stage performance within the stage came to be a recognised dramatic device even from the time of Kālidāsa. In the Act II of the *Mālavikāgnimitra*, there is a solo performance of *Chalitaka* type of dance by *Mālavikā*, followed by songs. Śrīharṣa, in the 7th. century, made a further development of the idea. In the Act III of his *Priyadarśikā* that we actually find is almost an embryo drama (to use Keith's terminology), a small play with bits of preliminary details within a play, and in the text it is rightly named as *Garbha-nāṭaka*. Bhavabhūti in the last

Act of the *Uttaracarita* and Rājasekhara in the Act III of his *Bālarāmāyaṇa* adopt the same device.

In the realm of dramaturgy, as it appears from above discussion, Garbhāṅka, as a device of the representation of plot appears first in the *Śṛṅgāra-prakāśa* of Bhoja in the 11th century, so far as extant texts are concerned. But here and also in the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* (12th cent.) and *Bhāva-prakāśana* (13th cen.), it is treated as indentical with Aṅkāvatāra. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa*, however, records a new definition of Garbhāṅka according to which the above old practice of inserting a dramatic representation within the body of an Act seems to be first recognised in the theory. The definition concerned, as quoted before, is apparently taken from the *Nāṭya-śāstra* but with significant changes in reading. This definition with its basis in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* was most probably shaped by some theorist with an eye on the said old practice and was included in some version of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, reasonably long before Rāmacandra-Guṇacandra who without any question to its authenticity included it in their work.

Later in the 14th century, Viśvanātha and Śiṅgabhūpāl took up Garbhāṅka but not as an Arthopakṣepaka. They treated it as topically related to Aṅka. According to Viśvanātha, Garbhāṅka is a play with *raṅgadvāra* and *āmukha* within a play. As an illustration Viśvanātha cites the *Sitā-svayamvara* scene,³⁴ called a Garbhāṅka by the poet himself in the Act III of the *Bālarāmāyaṇa*.³⁵ Śiṅgabhūpāl describes Garbhāṅka in the same light but more elaborately³⁶ and Rūpa Gosvāmin follows him closely.³⁷ This is in brief the history of Garbhāṅka in theory and practice.³⁸

IV. AṅKA-MUKHA (Aṅkāśya)

The *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* defines Aṅka-mukha, as the Act where there is a rèsuè of the leading ideas of all the following Acts.¹ The illustration is cited from the opening scene of the *Mālatī-mādhava* where there is an introductory report of all the main events to follow in

succeeding Acts.² In the text, however, the sence is called a Miśra-viṣkambhaka. The *Bhāva-prakāśana*, as usual, with other views gives the above definition and illustration of Aṅka-mukha.³ Dr Raghavan informs us that Bahurūpa wrongly ascribes the definition to Bharata (*ṣaṣṣahasrikāra*).⁴ As in the case of Aṅkāvatāra, Sāgara's view of Aṅka-mukha also is quite different from the more common conception. According to Sāgara Aṅkāvatāra consists in the prior indication of the events of the next Act at the close of an Act, and Aṅka-mukha means a résumé of the events of all other Acts in a particular Act. Thus, from this standpoint the difference between the two is clear. But this Aṅka-mukha of Sāgara is the Avatārāṅka (Aṅkāvatāra) of Abhinavagupta as explained before.

The definition of the Aṅka-mukha, as available in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* but which has been ascribed to Kohala by Abhinavagupta⁵; means that when the detached beginning of an Act is linked us by means of prior indication by some male or female character, evidently in the previous Act, it is called Aṅka-mukha. In principle, this definition of Aṅka-mukha is supported by Dhanañjaya, Rāmacandra and Śiṅgabhūpāla, but they use the term Aṅkāśya instead of Aṅka-mukha, and in the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* both the terms are clearly stated to be synonyms.⁶ Bhoja also gives the definition from the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.⁷ Śāradātanaya while enumerating the Arthopakṣepakas uses the term Aṅkāśya,⁸ but in his usual way gives all the variant definitions of Aṅkāśya and Aṅka-mukha. He quotes the definition and illustration of Aṅkāśya verbatim from the *Daśa-rūpaka* and *Avaloka* respectively⁹ and from the *Nāṭya-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kōśa* he takes those of Aṅka-mukha.¹⁰ Again, he gives another definition of Aṅkāśya which is very similar in form to that found in the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* and in matter to that of the *Daśa-rūpaka*, and a second of Aṅka-mukha which appears to be similar to that found in the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.¹¹ Thus *Bhāva-prakāśana* seems to give two definitions of each of the Aṅka-mukha and Aṅkāśya which appear to be recognised here as two separate devices. But the number of the Arthopakṣe-

pakas is five and Śaradātanaya seems to have no intention to disturb this fact recognised by all. It may thus be supposed that Śaradātanaya takes Aṅka-mukha and Aṅkāśya as the two names of the same device but gives all the available definitions with the name Aṅka-mukha or Aṅkāśya as found in his sources. Viśvanātha defines and illustrates Aṅka-mukha and his definition is quite in line with that of Sāgara and the illustration is also the same as in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* i.e., from the beginning of the *Mālati-mādhava*.¹² Then he simply quotes the definition and illustration of Aṅkāśya from the *Daśa-rūpaka* and *Avaloka* and also frankly admits: *etacca dhanika-matānusāreṇoktam*.¹³ Lastly Viśvanātha informs us that according to some this Aṅkāśya is covered by the definition of Aṅkāvatāra.¹⁴ It is thus clear that he himself does not recognise Dhanika's form of Aṅkāśya. Rūpa Gosvāmin, though at the very beginning of his *Nāṭaka-candrikā* despises the *prakriyās* of Viśvanātha,¹⁵ yet follows him closely in respect of Aṅka-mukha. He first gives the definition of Aṅka-mukha from the *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* with the word *aṅkāśya* in place of *aṅka-mukha* in the source, but remarks that this Aṅkāśya is identical with the Aṅka-mukha according to some. Then the definition of Aṅkāśya is quoted, apparently from the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* with the remark that it is covered by Aṅkāvatāra according to some.¹⁶ Thus it appears that Rūpa Gosvāmin prefers to use the term Aṅkāśya but follows Viśvanātha, so far as the treatment of the topic is concerned. It may be noted here that the definition of Aṅkāśya as found in the *Daśa-rūpaka* and *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* is similar to that of the Aṅka-mukha of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and that again has been ascribed to Kohala by Abhinavagupta as stated before. But we have seen that Sāgara defines Aṅkāvatāra as the indication of the following Act by means of a cryptic speech at the end of the preceding Act. This is undoubtedly similar if not identical, to the definition of Aṅka-mukha, as available in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and ascribed to Kohala by Abhinava-gupta.

Regarding the term *Aṅkāśya* it may be said that among the texts available to us, it is first found in the *Daśa-rūpaka*. The term itself signifies nothing new, only *mukha* of *Aṅka-mukha* of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* is substituted by its synonym *āśya* and this may be supposed to be due to metre causa, as it appears from the definition of *Aṅkāśya* in the *Daśa-rūpaka*. Sāgara and Bhoja stick to the old term. Other theorists who use the term *Aṅkāśya* either directly follow the *Daśa-rūpaka* or record its view as reference only.

We thus get two distinct views before us regarding the nature of *Aṅka-mukha*:

- (1) It is the résumé of the leading events of all other Acts. This is the view of Sāgara. Śāradātanaya records this definition of Sāgara and Bahurūpa ascribes the same to *Saṭsahasrikāra* i. e., to Bharata, but it is not found in the present *Nāṭya-śāstra*. Viśvanātha gives a similar definition of *Aṅka-mukha* and Rūpa Gosvāmin follows him. The definition of *Aṅka-mukha*, as available in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* is similar to that of *Avatārāṅka* (*Aṅkāvatāra*) of Abhinavagupta.
- (2) According to the *Nāṭya-śāstra* (or Kohala in the opinion of Abhinavagupta) *Aṅka-mukha* links up the detached beginning of an Act by means of prior indication. This is the most common view and is supported by Boja, Dhanañjaya, Rāmacandra-Guṇacandra and Śiṅgabhūpāla. Śāradātanaya also records the view. But this definition of *Aṅka-mukha* is similar to that of *Aṅkāvatāra* as found in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*. Viśvanātha and Rūpa Gosvāmin, perhaps due to the influence of Sāgara, maintain that this *Aṅka-mukha* (*Aṅkāśya*) is covered by *Aṅkāvatāra* of some.

It thus appears that there has been a long standing confusion regarding the nature of *Aṅkāvatāra* and *Aṅka-mukha* with its root in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and *Abhinavabhāratī*. In the present state of our knowledge and also with the present *Nāṭya-śāstra* in our hand we cannot say

which one of the two views, stated above, is earlier. The *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* maintains silence regarding the source of the definitions of both *Aṅkāvatāra* and *Aṅka-mukha*, but the view upheld therein cannot be declared later at least in the face of *Bahurūpa*'s opinion, as stated before. The view had also enjoyed a wide recognition, and this is evident from the works of some commentators and theorists, as shown before. Had it been a theory of obscure or later origin or of *Sāgara*'s own, it would not have been recognised by them. Who knows whether there was a version of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* or some similar renowned work available to *Sāgara* from which these views were derived.

V. Cūlikā

Sāgara says that *Cūlikā* is the name conventionally used to denote the speeches uttered by persons from behind the screen to serve some dramatic purpose.¹ In support of this statement *Sāgara* quotes :

*yathā paṭi-madhya-gataiḥ sūta-māgadha-vandibhiḥ/
arthopakṣepaṇaṃ yatra kriyate sā hi cūliketi*||²

Cūlikā neither indicates some future event necessarily, nor introduces a character on the stage always. When something related to the plot is hinted, indicated or reported from behind the curtain, it is called *Cūlikā*, and this is the common view.³ *Sāgara* maintains that generally *Sūtas* (charioteers), *Māgadhas* (panegyrists) and *Vandins* do the job. The word *vandinaḥ* has been taken to mean *Nagnā-cāryas*,⁴ referring to minstrels (not to naked teachers) as has been shown by Dr Raghavan with evidences from lexicons.^{4a} But the word in this sense is not of common use and the reading may be emended as, *nāndyācāryaḥ*, meaning *maṅgala-pāṭhaḥ*.^{4b} *Sāgara* further maintains that others, even leading characters may also take part in a *Cūlikā* and it is not intended that only the characters, mentioned above should always perform it.⁵ This

contention is supported with the views of Bharata and Āśmakutṭa⁶ :

*ata eva munirbharatācary / āśmakutṭaśca/
antaḥ paṇinivṛṣṭair yat kriyate'rtha-nivēdanam/
antar yamanikā-saṁsthaiś-cūlikārtha-prakāśanam||*

It is evident that this is not a full verse, as is treated in the text of the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kōśa*, but two halves of two separate verses from two different sources and Sāgara himself means to say so in *ata eva* etc., as above. Both, however, mean the something that Cūlikā is the informatin concerning the plot conveyed from behind the curtain by anyone.

Abhinavagupta informs us that Kohala defines Cūḍā (cūlikā) as : *arthopakṣēpaṇam cūḍā bahvarihaiḥ sūta-vandibhiḥ*.⁷ It is interesting to note that Kohala also assigns the task of performing the Cūḍā to such roles as Sūtas and Vandins etc. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* gives two names of this device viz., Cūlā and Cūlikā and then says : '*sā cūḍeva cūlikā*'.⁸ From all these it appears that Cūḍā, as given by Kohala, was the original name and the Cūlā and Cūlikā came from it.

Śiṅgabhūpāla gives a detailed account of Cūlikā⁹ and expressly states that it may occur at the beginning, middle or end of an Act and this has been taken up by Rūpa Gosvāmin.¹⁰ In the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* a distinction has been drawn between Cūlikā and Khaṇḍacūlikā. The former is the same as maintained by all other authorities. But when at the beginning of an Act, one character on the stage and the other behind the curtain take part in conversation and serve the purpose of Cūlikā, it is Khaṇḍacūlikā. Śiṅgabhūpāla points out that others call it a case of Viṣkambhaka, but he himself does not prefer to call it so, *enām viṣkambham evānye prāhur naitan matam mama*.¹¹ The illustration of this Khaṇḍa-cūlikā has been cited from the Act I of the *Bālarāmāyaṇa* of Rājasekhara.¹² But this is not the common view of Cūlikā.

VI. A general review of the Arthopakṣepakas

The five Arthopakṣepakas have been explained with a comparative study of the theories advanced by different authorities. There is a confusion regarding the term Arthopakṣepaka itself. The *Nāṭya-śāstra*, as we have it, uses the term only once in the chapter XIX (GOS) where all the five have been defined.¹ The two interludes, Praveśaka and Viṣkambhaka, however, are elaborately treated in the previous chapter. The verse that enumerates the five and contains the term Arthopakṣepaka and also the verses which define the five in the chapter XIX of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* (GOS) are held to be spurious by the editor of the GOS edition² on the grounds that (i) some of the manuscripts omit these verses, (ii) Abhinava's commentary on them are not available, (iii) some of these verses are mere repetitions as they are found in the previous chapter, and (iv) some of them are identical with the verses of Kohala, quoted by Abhinavagupta. But Dr K. K. Datta Shastri maintains that these verses of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* cannot be held spurious because, (i) omission of a passage in one or other manuscript does not necessarily imply its spuriousness, (ii) Abhinavagupta does not explain each and every passage of *Nāṭya-śāstra*, (iii) repetitions are not totally unknown to the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, (iv) verses attributed to Kohala by Abhinava may be considered as taken from the *Nāṭya-śāstra* verbatim by Kohala himself.³ Dr Shastri has justified each and every one of these contentions with sufficient evidences from the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, *Abhinava-bhārati* and the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*. But he himself admits that the text of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* is extremely uncertain in this portion.⁴ Moreover, what portions of the present *Nāṭya-śāstra* are pre-Bharatan, post-Bharatan, and Bharatan is yet to be finally settled. Kohala is presented before us in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* as one of the most prominent pupil of the sage Bharata and he has been entrusted with the duty of treating all matters left out in the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.⁵ His "relation with the *Nāṭya-śāstra* is not quite clear." The time and extent of the supposed influence⁶ of his

work on the redactors of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* has not yet been properly assessed. It may also be supposed that many verses of some earlier version of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* were taken verbatim by Kohala in his work and many verses from which, on the other hand, were included in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* long before Abhinavagupta. So, if some verses appear as identical with quotations from Kohala, we are not fully justified to call them spurious. It is also a fact that Abhinavagupta himself regards Kohala in some places as coeval with Bharata⁷. Moreover, the definition of *Aṅkāvatāra*, as quoted in the *Abhinava-bhārat* with the introductory remark *yathoktam*, shows that Abhinavagupta himself recognises it as taken from the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. This definition is almost identical with that found in the chap. XIX of the (GOS) *Nāṭya-śāstra*.^{7a} In another place Abhinavagupta remarks⁸ : *tathā ca kohalo 'arthopakṣepa-pāñcakam uktavān*, i. e., Kohala enumerated the five *Arthopakṣepakas*. If we are to believe on the evidence of this statement of Abhinavagupta that Kohala first defined each of the five *Arthopakṣepakas*, then we are to accept that the above mentioned definition of *Aṅkāvatāra* was taken by Abhinavagupta from the work of Kohala. But Abhinavagupta himself does not appear to have meant that, as shown above. We have seen that the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, elaborately treats *Praveśaka* and *Viṣkambhaka* in chapter XVIII (GOS). In chapter XIX (GOS) along with these two other three *Arthopakṣepakas* are defined. Of these three the definition of *Aṅkāvatāra* appears to be genuine from the above evidence of the *Abhinava-bhārat*. From all these it appears that the definitions of all the five were there and Kohala brought them under one general term *Arthopakṣepaka*, enumerated the five as Abhinavagupta puts it, and systematised the whole scheme. Kohala thus, may be credited with the coining of the term *Arthopakṣepaka*. Moreover, Abhinavagupta most reasonably points out that the *Nāṭya-śāstra* uses the term *Praveśaka* in several places instead of *Arthopakṣepaka*, as a generic one to signify either all the five devices or the two main ones

Praveśaka and Viṣkambhaka.⁹ Had the term Arthopakṣepaka been known originally, it could have been conveniently used. This term appears once in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* (GOS. XIX. 110) in the verse that enumerates the names of five devices and this verse may be said to be included in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* after Kohala.

An Act in a Sanskrit drama, as has been shown before, may consist in itself of more than one scenes. But Praveśaka and Viṣkambhaka are clear cut scenes in the modern sense of the term. The back-ground is never represented as changed in a Praveśaka or Viṣkambhaka, as is very often done in an Act. But regarding other three Arthopakṣepakas, it may be said that they are never treated, either in theory or in practice, as separate scenes outside an Act. Aṅkāvatāra and Aṅka-mukha are always included within one or other of the Acts and are never treated as entities exterior to the Acts like Praveśaka or Viṣkambhaka.¹⁰ Cūlikā consists of simply in the indication of something from behind the screen and nothing more.¹¹ So, if it occurs even at the very beginning of an Act, it cannot be taken as a separate scene.¹² Thus, generally speaking Aṅkāvatāra and Aṅka-mukha signify the nature of the beginning of an Act or a particular relation between two Acts. We have also seen that *ākāśa-vacana* and *nepathya vacana* are taken by Mātrgupta, Sāgara and others as Sandhyantaras. Cūlikā (i.e., utterance of something from behind the screen) in an Act is nothing but *nepathya-vacana* i.e., a Sandhyantara and cannot be included in the Arthopakṣepakas. Like the Aṅkāvatāra and Aṅka-mukha Cūlikā, perhaps, was also used to denote a particular style of beginning of an Act. Most probably it was taken to mean the starting of an Act with the indication of something from behind the screen through *nepathya-vacana*. The Viṣkambhaka at the beginning of the Act II and Acts III and V proper, of the *Uttara-rāma-carita* start with Cūlikā. Thus these three Arthopakṣepakas (viz., Aṅka-mukha, Aṅkāvatāra and Cūlikā) denote the modes of the beginning of Acts.

The above seems to be the view of Kohala who maintains

that there are three types of Acts marked by *Aṅkāvatāra*, *Cūdā* (*Cūlikā*) and *Aṅka-mukha*, as Abhinavagupta informs us.¹³ It thus appears that according to Kohala the *Aṅka* itself is the main *Arthopakṣepaka*, because the three types of these *Aṅkas* have been included in the five *Arthopakṣepakas* by himself.¹⁴ Sāgara also maintains that the *Arthopakṣepakas* are but *artha-pratipādakas*, those which set forth or introduce the theme of the drama.¹⁵ In this sense also *Aṅka* may be taken as an *Arthapratipādaka*.

From the view point of representation on the stage the *Nāṭya-śāstra* originally appears to have recommended the division of the plot into a number of acts (*Aṅkas*) and scenes (*Praveśaka* and *Viṣkambhaka*) to maintain a link of of the theme. The definitions of three types of *Aṅkas*, marked by *Aṅkāvatāra*, *Aṅka-mukha* and *Cūlikā* were there in the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. But perhaps, it was not clearly stated that they were the three varieties of Acts. Kohala, as it appears from the above discussion, first brought all the devices of representation of the plot, under one general term *Arthopakṣepaka* and enumerated the names of five *Arthopakṣepakas* and clearly stated that *Aṅkāvatāra*, *Aṅka-mukha* and *Cūlikā* are but three marks of Acts. Being the modes of their beginning these three appear to have been taken as the marks of Acts by Kohala.

Sāgara seems to be conscious of this old conception. He after fully describing the *Aṅka*, begins his discussion on the *Arthopakṣepakas* with the remark: *sampratyaṅka-vidhayaṁ praveśakādaya ucyante*,¹⁶ implying thereby that from the view point of representation on the stage before an audience, the *Praveśaka* etc., do not differ materially from an *Aṅka*.

The nature and function of the two types of interludes, *Praveśaka* and *Viṣkambhaka*, which are well marked scenes, have been elaborately discussed. It has also been shown that Sāgara, following the *Nāṭya-śāstra* maintains that there is no material difference between these two. He says that the *Viṣkambhaka* is *praveśakasthāniya*.¹⁷ Even later commentators also accept the above view. Rāghava-bhaṭṭa in his

Arthadyotanikā informs us that the Praveśaka between the Acts V and VI of the *Abhijñāna-śakuntala* is called the third Praveśaka by some as there are two Viṣkambhakas; one in the Act III and the other in the Act IV, thus this is the third Praveśaka.¹⁸ Śaṅkara in his *Rasa-candrikā* commentary on the same drama says : *praveśaka eva viṣkambhakah*.¹⁹

Prof. Jagirdar, on a study of the Praveśakas employed in the plays of Bhāsa, arrives at the general conclusion that the Praveśakas in Sanskrit drama in general, simply introduce the following main scenes.²⁰ This seems to be somewhat in conformity with the view held by Sāgara that Praveśaka introduces the entrance of the following leading character.²¹ Prof. Jagirdar further maintains that Viṣkambhakas are "concerned with incidents unrepresented on the stage, or supposed to have happened during the interval and also incidents connected with the hero and the heroine or the central theme."²² According to the said scholar here lies the distinction between the two, Praveśaka and Viṣkambhaka, and a parallelism can be established between Viṣkambhaka and Greek Chorus.²³ But these arguments do not seem to hold good so far as the dramas of even Kālidāsa are concerned. The Dhīvara scene is a Praveśaka in the *Abhijñāna-śakuntala* but it summarises the incidents unrepresented on the stage. It appears that both Praveśaka and Viṣkambhaka help the introduction of the following main Act and summarise the events or incidents unrepresented on the stage. Their difference lies elsewhere and that has already been discussed.

Later theorists, at least beginning from Dhanañjaya, divided the plot from the view point of representation on the stage, into two; *dr̥śya-śravya* and *sūcya*. The first division is to include portions which are meant to be elaborately delineated in Acts, and the second includes events and incidents which are only to be indicated through Arthopakṣepakas, as being unfit or uninteresting for elaboration and visible representation.²⁴ All the Arthopakṣepakas are thus limited as means for indication (*sūcanopāya*). This sort of division of the plot is unknown in the *Nāṭya-*

Sāstra and Sāgara also does not recognise this division. The original conception of Arthopakṣepaka, consisting of three types of Aṅkas (marked by Aṅkāvatāra, Aṅka-mukha and Cūlikā) and two types of scenes the Praveśaka and Viṣkambhaka, was totally lost. A strict line of demarcation came to be drawn between Aṅkas and Arthopakṣepakas. These later theorists missed the original implication of Aṅkāvatāra, Aṅka-mukha and Cūlikā and naturally a confusion arose. This confusion was worse confounded by the introduction of two new terms Garbhāṅka and Aṅkāśya. An attempt has been made to bring out the original significance of the devices which seems to be maintained, at least to a reasonable extent, in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kōśa*.

CHAPTER X

(i) TITLE OF THE PLAY

It is an old practice that the titles of literary compositions, not to speak of dramas only, are so selected that they either contain the designation of the hero or heroine or both, or simply the main theme is indicated in the title. Very often the indication of the theme and the designation of the hero or heroine are combined to form the title. The matter perhaps was considered to be so simple and obvious that neither the *Nāṭya-śāstra* nor most of the later texts on dramaturgy give any direction regarding the naming of dramatic compositions. From the *Nāṭya-śāstra* we get titles of two plays, one is *Amṛta-mañṭhana*, a *Samavakāra* and the other is *Tripura-daha*, a *Dima*. Both these titles are indicative of themes. There is another reference to a dramatic representation in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* where no title of the play is given but only the theme has been alluded to.¹ The *Mahābhāṣya* also seems to contain reference of subject matters of two plays.² It thus appears that a brief statement of the subject-matter served the purpose of titles of plays in the primary stage of its development. But *Aśvaghōṣa* names his play *Śāriputraprakaraṇa* by mentioning the name of the leading character and this perhaps indicates the next stage.

Chronologically speaking, so far as the extant texts are concerned, *Sāgara* first refers to a principle regarding the naming of plays. The text of the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* clearly shows that *Sāgara* here quotes the view of some ancient authority, though the name of the source is not given. It is enjoined that the title of the dramatic composition is to refer either to the *Pradhāna* (hero) or the *Vastu* (Plot). Titles of *Nāṭakas* like *Rāmānanda*, *Jānakī-rāghava* and that of the *Prakaraṇa* *Mālatīmādhava* have been cited as referring to the *Pradhāna* and those of the *Nāṭaka* *Kundamālā* and the *Prakaraṇa* *Mṛcchakaṭīka* have been taken as indicating the *Vastu*. It appears from this that by *pradhāna-nirdḍha* and

vastunirdeśa Sāgara simply means that the title of a drama is to contain either the designation of the hero or those of both the hero and heroine or a reference to the crucial incident of the plot. Śāradātanaya means the same when he says: *tannāma nāṭakādyaṅtar (nāyakaḍyaṅtar ?) garbhitārthopasūcakam*.⁴ The use of the word *garbhitārtha* (crucial incident) is undoubtedly an improvement upon Sāgara's *vastu-nirdeśa*.

The views expressed by Viśvanātha and Amṛtānanda in the 14th century are more elaborate. The latter says, *saṃjñā tu nāṭakādīnaṃ nāyakenetarceṇa va/nāyikānāyakaḍyākhyānāt saṃjñā prakaraṇādīṣu/nāṭikā-saṭṭakādīnāṃ nāyikābhīr-viśeṣaṇam*.⁵ This view gives much stress on the designations of the hero and heroine in naming a play but falls short to explain a title like *Kunda-mālā*, inasmuch as it omits the principle that the title of a play may be formed by referring to the main incident of the plot. Viśvanātha makes an attempt to give a more clear-cut principle and states that the title of a Nāṭaka should be: *garbhitārtha-prakāśaka*, the *Prakaraṇas* etc., are to be named after the names of the hero and heroine, whereas the name of the heroine alone may serve the purpose of naming Nāṭikā, Saṭṭaka etc.⁶ This rigid principle of Viśvanātha lacks corroboration to the titles of ancient dramas. Neither the title of the Nāṭakas *Mālavikāgnimitra* and *Jānakī-rāghava* may be said to be *garbhitārtha-prakāśaka*, nor the title *Mṛcchakaṭīka* or *Śāriputraprakaraṇa* is formed after the names of the hero and heroine. The broad principle of the *Nāṭak-lakṣaṇa-ratna kośa* seems to be more suitable to explain the titles of Sanskrit plays.

It is interesting to note that Rucipati in this matter quotes, *nāṭakasya ca yan-nāma garbha-nirdiṣṭa-lakṣaṇam*, and ascribes it to Bharata.⁷ Śaṅkara in his *Rasa-candrikā* commentary of the *Abhijñāna-śakuntala* gives a better generalisation regarding the naming of a drama. He says: *vastunā vastu-netṛbhyāṃ netṛā nāyikayāpi va/ dvābhyāṃ vā vastu-nārībhyāṃ kāryā saṃjñā tu rūpake*.⁸ The commentator is silent about the source of the verse but it is evident that this single verse can justify the title of any and every sanskrit drama.

(ii) Title of the Añka

Excepting the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*, none of the existing works on Sanskrit dramaturgy including the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, tries to formulate any principle regarding the naming of individual Acts of dramas. Sāgara maintains that the Acts of a drama may also be named according to the same principle stated in connection with the naming of the drama.¹ Thus, according to this view individual Acts may be named by the designation of the character taking the leading part in the Act concerned, or by the main incident delineated therein. In the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*, there are citations from as many as fifty-three individual Acts with titles.

Abhinavagupta, Dhanika, Rāmacandra-Guṇacandra and Śiṅgabdhūpāla are not found to refer the Acts by their titles. Śāradātanaya and Viśvanātha in many cases have cited from different Acts with titles.² But it is interesting to note that all the names of Acts, referred to in the *Bhāva-prakāśana* and in the chapter VI of the *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* are found in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*. Not only the names of Acts but the citations therefrom, as given by Śāradātanaya and Viśvanātha, occur in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* in similar contexts in almost all cases.³ In this matter the indebtedness of Śāradātanaya and Viśvanātha to Sāgara seems to be an undeniable fact.

Now, the naming of an Act becomes necessary only when its separate entity besides the part of a whole drama, is recognised for the representation on the stage, otherwise it appears to be quite useless to attach a title to an Act. Indian tradition recognises different types of one Act plays like Bhāṇa, Vyāyoga, Vīthī etc. There was also the practice of staging individual Acts in India and this becomes evident when we take into consideration the reason behind the naming of Acts. The title of a drama is required to be announced by the Sūtradhāra (or Sthāpaka) in the prelude. Similarly the name of an Act was also announced when it was staged.

Many of our extant dramas contain Acts with names. It is very often argued, specially in connection with the one Act plays of Bhāsa, that the hereditary actors of Kerala, the Cakyars, use to stage selected Acts from renowned Sanskrit dramas⁴. The *Ūrubhaṅga* of Bhāsa is generally taken to be such an Act of some lost lengthy *Mahābhārata*-drama.⁵ From our above discussion, it appears that the practice of staging selected Acts was not confined to Kerala only, more or less it was known to other parts of the country. In Kerala it was a regular practice, but in other parts of the country the practice does not appear to be a regular feature of representation. The silence of authorities like Abhinavagupta, Dhanañjaya etc., in the matter of either the principle of naming or referring to the names of individual Acts tends to support our contention. In this connection it may also be pointed out that a well-known commentator like Jagaddhara fails to understand the implication of the name *Vakula-vīthi* of the Act I of the *Mālatī-mādhava*. The grove itself and a garland of *vakula* flowers play an important part in the Act and as such it is named *Vakula-vīthi*. But the commentator in explaining the name quotes a definition of the *Vīthi*, an one Act minor *rūpaka* and wrongly ascribes the definition to Bharata.⁶ This shows a confusion regarding the name of an Act.

From a perusal of the foregoing chapters it appears that almost a separate literature had developed through ages on the dramatic plot and its analysis and division from different view points. An allegation is very often levelled against Indian theorists in the field of literary criticism, that they are over zealous in classification and elaboration. The validity of this allegation cannot be challenged but the reasons behind, should not be overlooked. The basically thoughtful and speculative Indian mind worked out through centuries an enormous philosophical literature. The rapid and parallel development of different systems of philosophy exerted its influence on literary criticism, not to speak of dramaturgy

alone. A philosophical precision and logical method of classification of all details were deemed essential in every field of knowledge.

From the very beginning, literary criticism in India came to be recognised as a Śāstra, giving injunctions regarding Vidhis and Niṣedhas, and as a Śāstra it was expected to follow the Śāstric method of delineation. Moreover, a deep regard for the works of ancient seers and contemporary demands compelled the authors to twist the ancient sayings for bringing out their own desired import and this gave rise to different interpretations of any single verse.

The present *Nāṭya-śāstra* undoubtedly presupposes a long tradition, well developed stage convention and also a full-fledged dramatic literature of which no trace has come down to us. Only a long process of observation, discrimination and experiment through centuries can give rise to such a comprehensive work as the *Nāṭya-śāstra* is. But the literature that formed the basis of this monumental work is sunk into oblivion. After the *Nāṭya-śāstra* was codified it acquired a sanctity, almost religious in character for which the work itself was certainly well-deserving. With this *Nāṭya-śāstra* as the foundation, an enormous literature grew up in course of time. In its development, it influenced and was also influenced by the prolific growth of dramatic literature, but with a fragment of which we are at present acquainted. This is the reason behind the host of theories on particular topics of dramaturgy while all the theorists owe their unswerving allegiance to the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. An attempt has been made in the preceding chapters to explain those controversial theories which come under our discussion and show that most of them had their origin in the *sūtra*-like composition of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* itself, amenable to several interpretations.

It has also been shown that a number of schools of thought developed long before Abhinavagupta and Sāgara and that these Schools maintained divergent opinions regarding the

source, structure, analysis and division of the plot. The theories propounded by these schools in most cases, as has been shown, are undoubtedly very significant effort in dramatic criticism.

About *Nāṭya-śāstra* there are problems like the traditions of *Ṣaṭ-sahasrī*, *Dvādaśa-sahasrī*, *Ādi-bharata*⁷ etc. It is generally admitted that there are two recensions of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. But in the preface of the GOS. edition Mr M. R. Kavi points out that no two out of forty manuscripts of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, agree completely.⁸ The same is the position regarding the printed versions of the text. The small portion of the text that comes under our subject of discourse, shows enumerable variations in readings which have been noted in proper places whenever thought to be necessary. Moreover, in the works of commentators on dramas, like Rāghava-Bhaṭṭa. Jagad-dhara, Rucipati, Śaṅkara etc., some verses are found to be ascribed to Bharata which are not available in the present *Nāṭya-śāstra*. Much weight cannot be attached to the words of these later commentators. But in cases where the ascriptions are supported by a text like the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kōśa* and are widely recognised, the quotations concerned can reasonably be taken as collected from some copy of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. In the foregoing chapters some such cases have been discussed, the most important of which are, the three ways of *bija-nyāsa*, appearance of a god at the end of a play, restriction to the entrance of a character without prior indication, and the verse *kuto'pi svecchayā* etc., distinguishing a Viṣkam-bhaka from a Praveśaka.

CHAPTER XI

VR̥TTI

The term Vṛtti is of special significance in almost all the branches of Sanskrit literature. In philosophical works, it is generally used to denote function (*vyāpāra*). In grammar also it is used to signify the function of expressing a different meaning other than those the parts of a particular word-formation contain (*parārthābhīdhānam vṛttiḥ*), and denotes Kṛt, Taddhita, Samāsa, Ekaśeṣa and the verb-forms with suffixes San etc. (*kṛt-taddhita-samāsaikaśeṣa-sanādyanta-dhāturūpāḥ pañca vṛttayaḥ*¹). In Alamkāra-literature, the significative capacity of words is called Vṛtti, and four varieties of it (Abhidhā, Lakṣaṇā, Vyāñjanā, Tātparya) have generally been recognised. The sense in which the term Vṛtti is used in Sanskrit dramaturgy has variously been expressed in English as 'bearing of characters'², 'manner or style'³, mode etc. A perusal of the number and different types of Vṛtti-s and their nature is essential for the understanding of the nature and function of Vṛtti itself and the position of the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* in this respect. It may be pointed out here that the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, *Bhāva-prakāśana* and *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* give accounts of the mythical origin of the Vṛtti-s of which Sāgara-nandin is quite silent. He only says : *etā vṛttayaś-caturvedī-samāśrayāḥ*. This simply indicates the origin of Drama from the four Vedas.

I. Number of Vṛtti-s

The *Nāṭya-śāstra* recognises four Vṛtti-s ; they are, Bhāratī, Sāttvatī, Kaiśiki and Ārabhaṭī. Sāgara accepts this view⁴ and does not refer to any other. But there was a confusion and it is evident from the *Abhinava-bhāratī*, *Bhāva-prakāśana*,

Daśa-rūpaka etc. Abhinava-gupta caustically refers to the views which maintain that the number of Vṛtti-s are two, three or five.⁵ He neither explains these views nor mentions the names of their propounders. He, however, deals elaborately with the view of Udbhaṭa and its criticism by Lolīṭa. Dr V. Raghavan (then a Research Scholar), in the *Journal of Oriental Research, Madras* (Vol. VI, pt. 4 and Vol. VII, pts. 1 and 2 ; 1932-33) elaborately discussed the entire problem concerning the Vṛtti-s in all their aspects. There he suggested the reasons of holding the number of Vṛtti-s as two and three. Any and every dramatic situation consists of Vāk and Ceṣṭā, and each of these two may be either Lalita or Uddhata. Bhāratī, Sāttvatī, Kaiśikī and Ārabhaṭī are essentially the Vṛtti-s of Vāk, Ceṣṭā, Lālitya and Audddhatya respectively. So, "The two Vṛtti-s are either the Bhāratī and the Sāttvatī referring to Vāk and Ceṣṭā or the Kaiśikī and the Ārabhaṭī referring to Lālitya and Audddhatya". Dr Raghavan further presumes that the "vyāpāra or activity of Vāk (speech), Kāya (body) and Manas (mind)" might have given rise to the view holding the number of Vṛtti-s as three.⁶ But the activities of Vāk and Kāya are not independent of the same of Manas. There is nothing in the *nāṭya-vyāpāra* which may be conceived of as purely the activity of mind, though it is the basis of all the *vyāpāra*-s. So, it is not convincing that the activities of Vāk, Kāya and Manas in *nāṭya-vyāpāra* prompted some ancient scholar to propound the theory of three Vṛtti-s. This theory of three Vṛtti-s is the thesis of Udbhaṭa, as will be discussed below. In favour of the view maintaining the number of Vṛtti-s as two, another reason may be adduced. Among the four principal objects of human life Dharma, Artha, Kāma and Mokṣa ; drama deals primarily with the second and third and taking these two into consideration two Vṛtti-s only may be accepted. Udbhaṭa himself suggests this, of course as a counter argument,—*kiñca yadi tāvat pumarthakāmoddeśena kaiśikyabhidhīyate dharmam-arthaṃ coddīśya vṛttidvayam vaktavyam*.⁷ Moreover, as will be shown, below,

Udbhaṭa divides the entire dramatic situation into two classes and this also may be taken to be the basis of the theory of two Vṛtti-s.

Udbhaṭa's theory of Vṛtti has been the source of controversy and confusion among ancient theorists and modern scholars alike. Dr S. N. Shastri⁸ remarks that apart from the four Vṛtti-s of Bharata, "Udbhaṭa believes in a fifth Vṛtti which he calls Artha-vṛtti." This is evidently based on the wrong observations of Dhanañjaya and Śāradātanaya. Dhanañjaya asserts that beyond the three (viz., Sāttvatī, Kaiśikī and Ārabhaṭī), there is no other Artha-vṛtti (*nārth-vṛttir-ataḥ-parā*). The fourth one, i.e., the Bhāratī is a Sabda-vṛtti. Dhanañjaya goes on to say that the followers of Udbhaṭa recognise these three Artha-vṛtti-s, but takes into account a fifth one :

kaiśikīm sāttvatīm cārtha-vṛttim-ārabhaṭīm-iti |

pañchantāḥ pañcamīm vṛttim-audbhaṭāḥ pratijānate ||⁹

Dhanañjaya does not specifically state that the fifth Vṛtti of Udbhaṭa is Artha-vṛtti. That Dhanañjaya means so, has probably been surmised on the basis of his above assertion *nārtha-vṛtti*—etc. It is Śāradātanaya who specifically states that the followers of Udbhaṭa recognise the fifth Vṛtti, the Artha-vṛtti, *audbhaṭāḥ pañcamīm-artha-vṛttim ca pratijānate*.¹⁰ Closely similar diction suggests that here in this case the source of Śāradātanaya is the Daśa-rūpaka.

Now, the standpoint of Udbhaṭa, so far as can be deciphered from the text of the *Abhinaya-bhāratī* is quite different from what Dhanañjaya and Śāradātanaya seems to have understood. Udbhaṭa appears to have criticised Bharata's scheme of four Vṛtti-s which are connected with speech (Vāk) and physical movements (Ceṣṭā) and as such, representations of death (*maraṇa*), swoon (*mūrcha*) etc., become devoid of any Vṛtti, as in these there is neither any Vāk nor Ceṣṭā. Thus, according to Udbhaṭa, the four Vṛtti-s of Bharata fail to comprehend the entire field of representation. For this and other reasons, Udbhaṭa gives up the old scheme of four Vṛtti-s and proposes a new one. He, for death and swoon

etc., establishes first the Phala-saṃvitti-ṛtti which is but the realisation of the fruit of Vāk and Ceṣṭā :

*tasmāt phalasaṃvittiyākhyā ṛtṭiḥ vāk-ceṣṭayor phalānubhava iti
yasyā lakṣaṇam, sābhyupagantavyā / avāṣyam caitat, anyathā
mūrchā-maranādau vāk-ceṣṭayor-abhāve nirṛtikataiva syāt¹¹ /*

Thus Udbhaṭa first divides the *nāṭya-vyāpāra* into two classes of situations where there are Vāk-Ceṣṭā and where there is the realisation of Phala but no Vāk-Ceṣṭā. Now, the situations related to Vāk and Ceṣṭā may either be proper (*nyāya*) or improper (*anyāya*). So, only three Ṛtti-s are to be recognised, viz., Nyāya-ṛtti, Anyāya-ṛtti and Phala-saṃvitti-ṛtti : *tasmāt (vāk) Ceṣṭātmikā nyāya-ṛttir-anyāya-ṛtti-rūpā tat-phala-saṃvittir-iti ṛtti-trayaṃ-eva yuktam-iti bhāṭṭodbhaṭo manyate.*¹² Thus, these observations of Udbhaṭa, as found in the *Abhinava-bhāratī*, uphold the theory of three Ṛtti-s. Abhinava-gupta further quotes a verse, presumably from the text of Udbhaṭa. This verse means that through Vāk and Ceṣṭā the Ṛtti is of two kinds, and these two with reference to the four Puruṣārtha-s become eight, which again through *nyāya* and *anyāya* become sixteen ; and the Phala-ṛtti is of many kinds due to the diversity of Rasa. In fine, Udbhaṭa propounds a new scheme of Ṛtti which has got no relation with that of Bharata. The standpoint of Udbhaṭa was forgotten leaving behind the name of Phalasaṃvitti in the memory of some which again was termed Arthavṛtti simply because *artha* in dramaturgy sometimes means *phala*. This seems to be the background of mis-statement found in the Daśa-rūpaka and Bhāva-prakāśana, as pointed out before.

Abhinava-gupta further refers to the view of the followers of Śakaligarbha who accept the four Ṛtti-s of Bharata but take recourse to a fifth one Ātma-saṃvitti by name, for bringing such situations as swoon etc., (where there is no Vāk-Ceṣṭā) under the fold of Ṛtti. This view actually, and not that of Udbhaṭa, upholds the scheme of five Ṛtti-s. The Ātma-saṃvitti Ṛtti, as Abhinava-gupta puts it, has been

thought to be inferred from such dramatic situations where there is no movement (*sakala-kārya-nivṛtṭyanumeyā*).¹³

The above two views, as *Abhinava-bhārati* informs us, have been bitterly criticised by Lollaṭa and finally exploded by Abhinava-gupta himself. Their arguments are mainly :

- a) Vṛtti means *vyāpāra*. But according to the followers of both Udbhaṭa and Śakaligarbha the Phala-saṃvitti and Ātma-saṃvitti are not related to any *vyāpāra*. Therefore, these two cannot be termed as Vṛtti at all.
- b) If everything related to *nāṭya* is to come in the fold of a Vṛtti, then to which Vṛtti the *raṅga*, musical instruments etc., are to belong?
- c) Representation of death or swoon is also the *vyāpāra* of mind at least and can be associated with the Sāttvati Vṛtti.¹⁴ So, there is no necessity of recognising any separate Vṛtti for them.

Abhinava-gupta thus, establishes the scheme of Bharata. It may be pointed out that Udbhaṭa and Śakaligarbha appear to have overlooked the fact that death, swoon etc., are imitated on the stage by the actors with conscious effort and as such, they cannot be treated as unrelated with *ceṣṭā*.

That there were other views on the number of Vṛtti-s is known from the *Sarasvatī-kaṇṭhābharaṇa*. Bhoja here (II/66-68) recognises a scheme of six Vṛtti-s that adds two new ones, Madhyama-kaiśikī and Madhyamārabhaṭī with the four of Bharata. Again (II/83-87) he refers to and rejects a view that admits of twelve Vṛtti-s characterised by three Guṇa-s. This second scheme seems to be formulated keeping Kāvya-s in view. In his *śṛṅgāra-prakāśa*¹⁵ again, Bhoja admits of a Vimiśra-vṛtti along with the four of Bharata. This new one according to Bhoja, possesses the features of all the four old ones. Sāgara-nandin, however, does not enter into the controversy and accepts the scheme of Bharata without any reservation. There are four Vṛtti-s according to this scheme, they are Bhārati, Sāttvati, Kaiśikī and Ārabhaṭī, and in these four Vṛtti-s respectively, says Sāgara,¹⁶ speech (*rāk*), emotional

absorption (*sattva*), grace (*lilā*) and physical action (*vyāyāma*) predominate. In *nāṭya* these four *Vṛtti*-s cannot be located in different water-tight compartments. The characteristics of one are very often than not found to coexist with those of others. Predominance of one or other of the above factors determines the *Vṛtti* in a particular dramatic situation. This point will be discussed later.

II. Characteristics of Different *Vṛtti*-s

The four *Vṛtti*-s and their varieties (*vṛtyaṅgas*) have been described by Sāgara-nandin mainly after the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. It may be pointed out here that *vṛtyaṅgas* are neither limbs nor subdivisions of *Vṛtti*-s as taken by some modern scholars.¹ They are varieties, forms through which a particular *Vṛtti* can be manifested. This point has been made clear by Sāgara-nandin when about Bhārati *Vṛtti* he says,—*asyā vṛtties-catvāro bheda āṅgatvam āgatāḥ*², i.e., four forms of this *Vṛtti* have come to be recognised as four *āṅgas*. In fact, the word *āṅga* in Sanskrit dramaturgy does not generally mean limb or subdivision. It may further be pointed out that the names of various *Vṛtti*-s and their *āṅgas* have been accepted in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* itself as *ruḍhiśabd*s. An enquiry into their meanings as done by Abhinava-gupta and others, leads us nowhere so far as their characteristics are concerned. Sāgara-nandin makes no such attempt.

A. Bhārati

Sāgara-nandin quotes the definition of Bhārati from the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.³ In Bhārati, speech of male characters speaking Sanskrit predominates (*vāk-pradhānā puruṣa-prajojyā.. saṁskṛta-pāṭha-yuktā*) and females are excepted (*stṛi-varjitā*). This is the *Vṛtti* of actors (and not of actresses) who are known as the sons (disciples) of Bharata. Four varieties of this *Vṛtti* are

recognised, viz. *Prarocanā*, *Āmukha*, *Vithī* and *Prahasana*. Of these *Vithī* and *Prahasana* are two separate types of plays. Neither the *Nāṭya-śāstra* nor the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* has discussed the characteristics of these two varieties here in this connection.⁴ *Prarocanā* also has not been defined in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* here in this context. It is simply said that in the *Pūrvaraṅga* the (performance of), auspicious *Prarocanā* is conducive to success, prosperity and victory, it wards off the evil. *Sāgara-nandin* quotes this verse⁵ but adds no comment. The *Nāṭya-śāstra* defines *Prarocanā* in the fifth chapter (GOS.) as an element of the *Pūrvaraṅga*. There it is said that the *Prarocanā* is to induce the audience to the play to be staged through suggestion to its theme with cogent reasons and having reference to the *siddhi*.⁶ In one manuscript, however, the verse is repeated in connection with the discussion on *Vṛtti*.⁷ *Sāgara-nandin* says that *Prarocanā* is so called as it presents a well known idea (*prasiddhārtha-pradarśanī*)⁸ delineated in a play. He further informs us that according to some the mention of the theme of the drama to be staged through some well-established topic is *Prarocanā*. An illustration has been cited from an unknown drama *Naraka-vadha*.⁹ In conclusion, however, *Sāgara-nandin* enjoins that to introduce the *Mukha* and other *Sandhi*-s, *Prarocanā* should be done at the beginning, and there the *Nāndī* which is the obligatory element of *Pūrvaraṅga* is to be performed.¹⁰ Thus, it appears that according to *Sāgara-nandin* *Prarocanā* is an element of the *Pūrvaraṅga*.

The utility of *Prarocanā* consists in rousing the interest of the audience about the theme of the play and it is an *aṅga* of the *Pūrvaraṅga*. There are no two opinions regarding this view.¹¹ Another *aṅga* of the *Bhāratī* is *Āmukha*, i.e., *Prastāvanā*.¹² *Nāndī*, in actual practice, invariably occurs in the *Prastāvanā*. Thus it appears that *Āmukha* itself forms a part of the *Pūrvaraṅga*. But here there are different opinions. *Abhinava-gupta* appears to maintain that *Prarocanā* and *Āmukha* as *aṅgas* of the *Bhāratī* are different from these of

Pūrvaraṅga.¹³ Of course, neither in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* nor in the *Abhinava-bhāratī* it has been clearly stated that Āmukha is a part of the Pūrvaraṅga. Sāgara-nandin discusses both Prarocanā and Āmukha in this chapter of Vṛtti, particularly in connection with the Bhāratī. He, however, does not limit the Bhāratī in the Pūrvaraṅga only as done by some. For the clarification of this point characteristics of other Vṛtti-s are required to be explained. Pūrvaraṅga and Āmukha by themselves are two controversial topics and require separate chapters excepting, of course, their relation with the Vṛtti, and that has been taken up here in this chapter. Those two have been elaborately discussed by Dr Kalikumar Datta Shastri in two illuminating papers, Prologues and Epilogues in Sanskrit Drama and Pūrvaraṅga : Bharatan and Post-Bharatan.¹⁴

B. Sāttvatī

Sāgara-nandin quotes the definition of Sāttvatī from the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.¹ The chief characteristic of this Vṛtti is *sāttvata-guṇa* which is explained as noble qualities like obedience to one's superiors : *guru-śūśrūṣādi-sadvṛttayaḥ*. Abhinava-gupta takes the expression to mean mental affairs : *mānasa-vyāpāraḥ*.² This is in conformity with the next verse of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*³ where it is said that this Vṛtti is characterised by emotion and its expression through speech and gestures : *vāgāṅgābhī-nayavatī...| sāttvādhikārayukta .. ||* The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* makes the point more clear.⁴ It says that Sāttvatī is the mental affair (*mānasaṃ karma*) connected with three types of acting, emotional, verbal and physical (*sāttvābhīnaya-vāgābhīnaya-āṅgābhīnaya-yuktam*), and that the first type predominates. Representation of sacrifice and heroism (virtuous conduct, *nyāya-vṛtta*, according to the reading of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*) is another characteristic of Sāttvatī. This Vṛtti is full of exhilaration having the grief subdued. It is further said that Sāttvatī abounds

in haughty characters exchanging insulting words : *uddhata-puruṣa-prāya paraṣparādharṣaṇakṛta*⁵. All these features of this Vṛtti have been illustrated in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* but most of which are not from dramatic compositions. The four forms of this Vṛtti are Utthāpaka, Parivartaka, Saṃlāpa⁶ and Sāṅghātya.

Utthāpaka

What comes out from the definition of the Utthāpaka as quoted by Sāgara-nandin (probably) from the *Nāṭya-śāstra* is that it consists in exchange of haughty words in attempts of exciting the opponent.⁷ In different words Dhanañjaya, Śiṅga-bhūpāla and Viśvanātha also maintain the same.⁸

Parivartaka

The word *parivartaka* signifies a change and this has been taken to be the main characteristic of Parivartaka in all the works on dramaturgy including the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. Of the three definitions found in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*⁹, the first one means that Parivartaka consists in one's taking up another course of action after giving up a profitable but unsuccessful undertaking. The *Nāṭya-śāstra* also means the same when it says : *utthāna-samārabdhān-arthān-utsṛjya yo'rtha-yoga-vaśāt | anyān-arthān bhajate.....* ||¹⁰ That Parivartaka is the changing of one's own course of action, is also the opinion of Dhanañjaya, Śiṅga-bhūpāla, Viśvanātha etc.¹¹

The second definition given by Sāgara-nandin, also states that it is called Parivartaka when one takes resort to force (*daṇḍam-āsthāya*) finding intrigue (*bheda*), conciliation (*sāma*) and gift (*dāna*) are of no avail. Sāgara-nandin further informs us that according to some Parivartaka is the ripening of an action undertaken for some purpose in an unforeseen way

through fate,—*prakṛtasya kāryasya daivavaśād anyathaiva paripākaḥ*. There is one common factor in all the above definitions of Parivartaka and that is a change, either calculated or unforeseen.

Samlāpa (NS. Sallāpa)

Samlāpa, as the name implies, is exchange of words with or without threats (*sādharaṣajo nirādharṣajo dvividhaḥ*) and thus of two types. This is the opinion of Sāgara evidently following the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.¹² The *Daśa-rūpaka*, however, defines Samlāpaka as serious dialogue (*gavīroktiḥ*) having diverse feelings and sentiments (*nānā-bhāva-rasā-mithaḥ*). Śiṅga-bhūpāla and Viśvanātha follow Dhanañjaya.¹³

Sāṅghātya (NS. Sāṅghātyaka)

Sāṅghātya in Sanskrit dramaturgy has been taken to imply such dramatic situations where the breaking up of an alliance is represented. It may be due to several reasons, deliberation, bribing, blunder or luck.¹⁴ According to Sāgara-nandin, Sāṅghātya is deception (*kūḷa uchyate*). He says that it is illustrated in the false rumour of Vāsavadattā's death in the conflagration at Lāvaṇaka and in the drama *Rāghavābhyaudaya* where Rāvaṇa to deceive Rāma, disguises the demoness Jālinī as Sītā in connection with a false peace.¹⁵ It thus appears that intrigue or deception is the chief characteristic of Sāṅghātya according to Sāgara-nandin.

From the above, it is evident that Sāttvatī Vṛtti is connected with dramatic situations mainly of political nature and fight-shows on the stage. It may be pointed out here that the *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* sums up the above characteristics of different forms of Sāttvatī without mentioning the names of the forms.¹⁶

C. Kaiśiki

Kaiśiki is pre-eminently the Vṛtti of dramatic situations depicting erotic sentiment. The *Nāṭya-śāstra* gives practically two definitions of this Vṛtti. One of them is in *Indravajrā* metre :—

*yā slakṣṇa-nepathya-viśeṣa-citrā strī-samyutā yā bahu-nṛtya-
gītā |
kāmapabhoga-prabhavopacārā tāṃ kaiśikīm vṛttim udāha-
ranti ||*¹

and the other in the *Ārya* :—

*bahuvādyā-nṛtta-gītā śṛṅgārābhinaya-citra-naipathyā |
mālyālankāra-yutā praśasta-veṣā ca kāntā ca ||
citra-pada-vākya-bandhair alankṛtā hasita-rudita-roṣādyaiḥ |
strī-puruṣa-kāma-yuktā vijñeyā kaiśikī vṛttiḥ ||*²

The first one in *Indravajrā* of these two definitions has been commented upon by Abhinava-gupta and has also been accepted by Viśvanātha³ with a minor difference in reading. The second definition in *Ārya* speaks the same thing as in the first one, in different phraseology with a few added unimportant details. It is to be pointed out here that in the case of *Ārabhaṭī*, Abhinava-gupta comments upon the definition in *Āryā* and omits the other in *Indravajrā* metre. The definition of the Kaiśiki in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* is not taken verbatim from the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, but does not differ from that of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* materially.

*śṛṅgārābhinayod-bhāsi-pāṭhya-mālyā-vibhūṣaṇā |
nṛtya-vāditra-gītāḍhyā kāmasambhoga-lakṣaṇā ||
sukumāra-kāvya-bandhām ujjala-vastrābharāṇa-veṣām ca ||
kāmapacāra-bahulām bhāṣante kaiśikīm kavayaḥ ||*⁴

Kaiśiki-Vṛtti is marked by the representation of love scenes. Bright make-up and dressing, love songs, amorous dances, graceful gestures and delicate poetic dialogues are the chief characteristics of this Vṛtti. This is the most charming Vṛtti and excepting a few like the *Mudrā-rākṣasa*, all our ancient

plays are found to have given much scope to this Vṛtti. Similarly, the authors of dramaturgy also paid greater attention to the elaboration of this Vṛtti giving rise to difference of opinions.

Narman may be said to be the soul of Kaiśikī as the names of its forms suggest. The connotation of the term Narman is also very wide. It includes dalliance, grace, pleasantry and the like. The four varieties of this Vṛtti are,—Narman, Narma-sphoṭa, Narma-garbha and Narma-sphañja.

Narman

Sāgara-nandin draws no distinction between Narman the *aṅga* of Prati-mukha-sandhi and the same a variety of Kaiśikī. Of the former he says that it will be discussed later, i.e., in the context of Kaiśikī.⁵

The definition and illustration of Narman in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kōśa* present it as the expression of hidden emotion (*antargatākūṭam*) under some pretext (*chadma-garbhakam*) and is free from blaming others and coarse or obscene language (*parāpavādaiḥ parūṣair-aślilaisca vivarjitam*).⁶ Sāgara-nandin refers evidently to the *Nāṭya-śāstra* when he says that the teachers describe Narman as abounding in merry words promoting love.⁷ The *Nāṭya-śāstra* adds two more traits of Narman with the above, it is *viśuddha-karaṇam* and *nivṛtta-vīraṇam*.

The *Nāṭya-śāstra* describes three types of Narman.⁸ In this connection Abhinava-gupta remarks that Narman is marked by the pre-eminence of laughter (*hāsa-pradhānatā tadeti sāmānya-lakṣaṇam*), and this laughter (comic) may be due to the expression of jealousy (*tatra hāsa īrṣyām vā sūcayitum*), or to rebuke others (*paraṃ vopālabdhum*), or to attract other's mind (*para-hṛdayaṃ vākṣeptum*); and thus, it is of three types.⁹

Sāgara-nandin refers to a view and that also admits of three varieties of Narman but as it is distinguished by laughter, desire and fear : *hāsecchā-bhayabhedenā narmātra trividham bhavet* |

The first variety is the joke (*parihāsa*) with amorous gestures of man or woman inflaming love :

śṛṅgāroddīpano yaḥ syāt parihāsa savibhramah |
*strī-puṁsayostu narmaitad-dhāsyabheda-vyavasthitam ||*¹⁰

It is interesting to note that this variety of Narman has been designated by Sāgara-nandin himself as Saṁjoga-vihita-narma or Suddhā Kaiśikī in another place. There a verse has been quoted of which the first half is *śṛṅgāroddīpano* etc. ; and the second half is, *hāsecchā-bhaya-bhedena* etc., as quoted above.¹¹

The second variety of Narman, i.e., the variety distinguished by desire, has been described as such situations where the heroine from a hiding place pelts her beloved with flowers and willingly comes within his sight,¹² evidently urged by love. The Narman with fear has not been defined but illustrated, that describes a situation where a lady though angry, yet she embraces her beloved out of fear from thunder and lightning.¹³ It is clear that Sāgara-nandin does not follow the *Nāṭya-śāstra* in describing the varieties of Narman.

Dhanañjaya, Śiṅga-bhūpāla, Viśvanātha and Rūpa-gosvāmin follow the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and maintain that *hāsyā* is the main feature of Narman. But they describe Narman as primarily of three types ; *śṛṅgāra-hāsyaja*, *suddha-hāsyaja* and *sabhaya-hāsyaja*. Dhanañjaya further divides Narman into eighteen types. Others follow Dhanañjaya excepting Viśvanātha who makes the number nine.¹⁴

Narmasphoṭa

Sāgara-nandin describes Narmasphoṭa as a situation where an unmarried girl (*kanyā*) in secret company with the hero being discovered by the heroine is overcome with fear and shame, while the hero remains silent as if doing nothing.¹⁵ But according to the *Nāṭya-śāstra* as commented upon by Abhinava-gupta, Narmasphoṭa is the partial manifestation (*asama-grāhaka-rasa*) of the emotion of love contributed by

the touches of different other feelings (*vividhānām bhāvānām lavair-lavair-bhūṣito*) like fear, laughter, alarm, anger etc. (*bhaya-hāsa-harṣa-trāsa-roṣādyāḥ*).¹⁶ The *Daśa-rūpaka* also speaks the same in different words : *bhāvānām sūcito'-lpa-raso lavaiḥ*.¹⁷ Śingabhūpāla accepts this definition of Narmasphoṭa and adds another¹⁸ :—*anyais-tvakāṇḍe sambhoga-viccheda iti gīyate*. This is similar to that of *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*. Viśvanātha and Rūpa-gosvāmin follow the *Daśa-rūpaka*.¹⁹ It is interesting to point out here that Saṅkara in his commentary on the *Abhijñāna-śakuntalam* quotes from an anonymous source a definition according to which Narmasphoṭa consists in private conversation of the hero and heroine conducive to enjoyment.²⁰ Jagaddhara, on the other hand, quotes from another unknown source that Narmasphoṭa is the manifestation of inner feelings.²¹ It is thus evident that there were several divergent opinions regarding the definition of Narmasphoṭa.

Narmagarbha

Sāgara-nandin describes Narmagarbha²² as such situations where one waits in disguise for the fulfilment of purpose i.e., love affair. This is evidently the gist of the definition of Narmagarbha found in the *Nāṭya-śāstra*,²³ where it is said that when the hero acts with his identity concealed through various means suitable to love affairs, it is Narmagarbha. The *Daśa-rūpaka* also defines Narmagarbha as : *channa-netrpraticāro narma-garbho'rtha hetave*.²⁴ Viśvanātha also takes Narmagarbha in the same sense when he says : *narmagarbho vyavahṛtir-netuḥ pracchanna-vartinaḥ*.²⁵ Jagaddhara gives from an anonymous source a definition that states that where the hero conceals himself for some purpose, it is Narmagarbha.²⁶ It may be pointed out here that all the works discussed above, explain Narmagarbha as the behaviour of the hero and are silent about the heroine. It is the *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* that

includes similar behaviour of the heroine also in the definition of Narmagarbha.²⁷

The GOS. edition of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* records a peculiar definition of Narmagarbha as occurring in some manuscripts. According to this definition, that is also Narmagarbha where after the death of the former hero a second one takes his place.²⁸ The commentary of Abhinava-gupta on this verse is not available. But this view has been referred to by Śiṅga-bhūpāla as that of Bharata.²⁹ It appears that this view came to be recognised as one of Bharata at least before the 13th century A.D. Śiṅga-bhūpāla further informs us that according to some, this is the *saṃkṣipta* (*saṃkṣiptaka*) type of Ārabhaṭī.

Narmasphañja

Sāgara-nandin defines Narmasphañja after the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, as the enjoyment of the first union with a beautiful girl the consequence being troublesome.³⁰ This is illustrated, says Sāgara-nandin, where the king in company of a girl is detected by the queen and thus both are in trouble. The matter ends with difficulty.³¹

Abhinava-gupta reads the name as Narmasphuñja and takes *sphuñja* to mean obstacle : *narmaḥsphuñja vighna ityarthah*.³² Narmasphañja has been taken in the above sense in the *Daśa-rūpaka*, *Rasārṇava-sudhākara* and *Sāhitya-darpaṇa*. But it is interesting to note that in the *Daśa-rūpaka* the term is Narma-sphiñja and in *Sāhitya-darpaṇa* it is Narma-sphūrja.³³

It is apparent that Sāgara-nandin fails to distinguish between Narmasphoṭa and Narmasphañja. Both of these varieties of Kaiśikī have been described by him as situation where the hero in dalliance with a girl is detected by the heroine. This is Narmasphañja according to the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and other works.

D. Ārabhaṭī

Ārabhaṭī is defined in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* as :

*ārabhaṭa-prāya-guṇā tathaiva bahu-kapaṭa-vañcanopetā |
dambhānṛta-vacanavati tvārabhaṭī nāma vijñeyā ||*¹

This verse is commented upon by Abhinava-gupta. There is another verse in *Indravajrā* metre on which the commentary of Abhinava-gupta is not available.

*pustāvapāta-pluta-laṅghitāni cchedyāni māyākṛtam-indrajālam |
citrāṇi yuddhāni ca yatra nityam tām tādṛśim ārabhaṭīm
vadanti ||*

This verse, informs the editor of the GOS. version, is a recognised one of Bharata.²

Sāgara-nandin defines Ārabhaṭī as :

*samuddhata-prāya-guṇā vīra-raudrādbhutātmikā |
kapaṭānṛta-dambheṣu vañcanāskandayoḥ sthitā ||*³

It is apparent that this definition, though not a verbatim reproduction, yet it does not differ materially from the first one of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. Ārabhaṭī is primarily the *Vṛtti* of violence (*auddhatya*) as against grace (*lālitya*) of Kaiśikī. The Ārabhaṭī, as stated by Sāgara-nandin, is associated with heroic, terrible and marvellous feelings ; and rests on deceit, falsehood, arrogance, treachery and assault. It is doubtful whether Sāgara-nandin means to assign the *Vīra* and *Adbhuta* Rasas to Ārabhaṭī. Perhaps, only *bhāvas* are meant here. The point will be discussed later. It is further stated in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* that Ārabhaṭī is the *Vṛtti* of such situations as war, combat, magic illusion, tearing, leaping etc., *yuddha - niyuddhendrajāla - māyā - chedana - plutādibhir - ārabhaṭī jñeyā*.⁴ This appears to be based on the second definition of Ārabhaṭī quoted above from the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. Four varieties of Ārabhaṭī have been recognised, viz., *Samkṣiptaka*, *Avapāta*, *Vastūttāpana* and *Sampheta*.

Samkṣiptaka

The *Nāṭya-śāstra* defines *Samkṣiptaka* as :

*anvartha-silpa-yukto bahu-pustotthāna-citra-nepathya |
samkṣipta-vastu-viśayo jñeyo samkṣiptako nāma.* ||⁵

Sāgara-nandin gives almost an identical definition :

*saṁkṣipta-vastu-viśayaḥ prayogāśrita-silpavān |
bahu-pustotthāna-kṛtair-veśaiḥ saṁkṣiptako mataḥ* ||⁶

Samkṣiptaka is *saṁkṣipta-vastu-viśaya* and this expression has variously been taken to mean by modern scholars as, consisting in brief arrangement of some matter,⁷ a matter summarily dealt with,⁸ condensed matter.⁹ But all these yield no sense. Ārabhaṭī is not the Vṛtti primarily of *sūcya* portions of the plot. So, the question of condensation or the like does not arise. Sāgara-nandin also gives no explanation. But Abhinava-gupta rightly interprets the expression as : *saṁjñayā kṣiptāni vastūni viśayo'syeti...* | He further states : *tāni vastūni darśayati (anvartheti) |..... prayojanenānugatāḥ śilpayuktāḥ kuśala-śilpi-viracitāḥ, arthā yatreti* ||¹⁰ Thus Samkṣiptaka consists mainly in the presentation of symbolic objects (*saṁjñayā...*) which are artificially constructed for dramatic representations (*prayogāśrita...*). This presentation of symbolic objects includes many Pustas i.e., scenic appliances like models of charriot etc. shield, armours banners etc., as stated by Sāgara-nandin.¹¹ Varieties of dress also constitute another element of Samkṣiptaka.

The *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* records that according to some theorists the appearance of the second hero after the fall of the first one (*pūrva-nāyaka-nāśenā-para-nāyaka-sambhavaḥ*) is Samkṣiptaka, as illustrated in the installation of Vibhīṣaṇa to the throne after the death of Rāvaṇa.¹² *Daśa-rūpaka* as interpreted by Dhanika, also state that Samkṣipti (Samkṣiptaka) consists both in (a) the replacement of one hero by another, and (b) in the change of the temperament of a character from one type to another, as illustrated in the change of Paraśurāma's attitude from arrogance to quietude. The use of Pusta, of course, has been accepted as a mark in another definition of Samkṣiptaka.¹³ Viśvanātha simply quotes Dhanika's comment.¹⁴ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* also accepts

the view as a variety of Ārabhaṭi.¹⁵ It has been pointed out before that the above is the characteristic of Narmagarbha according to Bharata, as informed by Śiṅga-bhūpāla. To the same effect a verse is also found in the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, of course without the commentary of Abhinava-gupta. It is practically impossible now to trace the origin of these conflicting views regarding the characteristics of Saṃkṣiptaka.

Avapāta

According to the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*, Avapāta is the behaviour of one totally bewildered (*sarvathā viklavasya ceṣṭitam*). It is a situation of commotion represented through the rapid entrance and exit of characters bewildered with fear or joy or panic or confusion.¹⁶ This is based on the definition of Avapāta as given in the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.¹⁷ Other theorists also maintain this view.¹⁸

Vastūthāpana

Sāgara-nandin gives no definition but describes Vastūthāpana with illustrations and their exposition.¹⁹ Vastūthāpana consists in situations where different characters express different sentiments in connection with a single issue (*nānā-rasa-yuktaṃ bandhūnāṃ ceṣṭitam*). It has been illustrated by Sāgara-nandin with reference to various behaviours expressive of different sentiments of those who were related to Madana and Rāma when they were encountered by Śambara and Paraśurāma respectively. This is the characteristic of Vastūthāpana according to the *Nāṭya-śāstra*²⁰ also, which, however, adds that there may or may not be the element of panic (*savidravā-vidravāśrayam vāpi*).

Daśa-rūpaka gives quite a new definition of Vastūthāpana according to which it consists in the creation of objects by magic (*māyādyutthāpitam vastu*). Viśvanātha and Śiṅga-bhūpāla maintain the same view.²¹ This view, evidently rests

on the meaning of the word *vastūtthāpana* i.e., creating of objects by magic, an element of *Ārabhaṭi-vṛtti*.

Sampheta

Sāgara-nandin closely follows the *Nāṭya-śāstra* and describes *Sampheta* as a tumultuous situation (*sambhrama-mayaḥ*) where there may be much of fights, combats and intrigues (*yuddha-niyuddhabahulaḥ kapaṭa-mayaḥ*) along with terrible clash of weapons.²² *Daśa-rūpaka* describes *Sampheta* simply as fighting of two angry persons, and this has been followed by *Śiṅga-bhūpāla* and *Viśvanātha*.²³ Preponderance of the heroic, terrible and marvellous sentiments is another mark of *Sampheta* according to the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*.²⁴

From a perusal of the characteristics of *Sāttvatī* and *Ārabhaṭi* as discussed above, it becomes clear that while the former is concerned with the delineation of such noble qualities as obedience to superiors, heroism etc., the latter is that of arrogance, treachery, deceit etc. The movements and gestures of characters on the stage in *Sāttvatī* should be restrained and dignified; but in *Ārabhaṭi* those are required to be violent. There may be a bit of softness, an element of *Kaiśikī*, in *Sāttvatī*, but *Ārabhaṭi* is opposed to it.

III. Vṛtti and Rasa

That there has been a longstanding controversy regarding the distribution of *Rasa*-s among the *Vṛtti*-s is evidenced by a number of divergent readings available in respect of the two verses concerned of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* (GOS), as quoted below¹:

- I) *hāsyā-śṛṅgāra-bahulā kaiśikī paricakṣitā |*
sāttvatī cāpi vijñeyā vīrādbhuta-śamāśrayā ||
- II) *raudre bhayānake caiva vijñeyārabhaṭi budhaiḥ |*
bībhatse karuṇe caiva bhāratī samprakūṛṭitā ||

Different readings in (I), first half :

hāsyā-śṛṅgāra-karuṇair-vṛttiḥ syāt kaiśikī rasaiḥ |

second half :

a) *sāttvatī caiva vijñeyā vīra-raudrādbhutāśrayā |*

b) *vīre cāpyadbhute caiva vṛttiḥ syāt sāttvatī |*

Different readings in (II), first half :

bhayānake ca bibhatse raudre cārabhaṭi bhavet |

second half :

a) *bhāratī cāpi vijñeyā karuṇādbhutarūpayoh |*

b)vira-hasyādbhutāśrayā

c) *sarveṣu rasa-bhāveṣu bhāratī samprakīrtitā*

The following conflicting views emerge out of the above regarding the assignment of Rasa-s to each of the Vṛtti-s in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* itself :

Rasas-s assigned to Bhāratī :

(i) Bibhatsa and Karuṇa

(ii) Karuṇa and Adbhuta

(iii) Vīra, Hāsyā and Adbhuta

(iv) All Rasa-s

to Sāttvatī :

(i) Vīra, Adbhuta and Śama i.e. Śānta

(ii) Vīra, Raudra and Adbhuta

(iii) Vīra and Adbhuta

to Kaiśikī :

(i) Hāsyā and Śṛṅgāra

(ii) Hāsyā, Śṛṅgāra and Karuṇa

to Ārabhaṭī :

(i) Raudra and Bhayānaka

(ii) Raudra, Bhayānaka and Bibhatsa

Sāgara-nandin refers to a view that assigns Karuṇa and Adbhuta to Bhāratī (*bhāratī karuṇādbhute*) and then quotes :

*virādbhuta-prahaṣanairiha bhāratī syāt
sāttvatyapiha gaditādbhuta-vīra-raudraiḥ |
śṛṅgāra-hāsyā-karuṇair api kaiśikī syād-
diṣṭā bhayānaka-yutārabhaṭī saraudrā ||²*

According to this view : Rasa-s of the Bhāratī are Vīra,

Adbhuta and Hāsyā ; to Sāttvati are assigned Adbhuta, Vira and Raudra ; to Kaiśiki belong Śṛṅgāra, Hāsyā and Karuṇa ; and to Ārabhaṭi,—Bhayānaka and Raudra. This is the view of the *ācārya* (*ācārya-matam*), as Sāgara-nandin puts it. He himself, however, maintains that Bhāratī pervades all the Rasa-s (*rasān sarvān iyam vṛttir-bhāratī vyāpya tiṣṭhati*), and that though there are four Vṛtti-s, it is in Bhāratī that the three others are united ; *ekībhāvastu sarvāsām bhāratyām eva dṛśyate*.³ Now, by *ācārya* in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*, invariably Bharata has been referred to. But the verse quoted above as one of the *ācārya* is actually of Kohala as informs the editor of the GOS. edition of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.⁴ Abhinava-gupta also remarks : *yattu śṛṅgāra-hāsyā-karuṇair-ihā kaiśiki syād iti kohalenoktam tan-muni-mata-virodhād-upekṣyam eva*,⁵ i.e., the view of Kohala that assigns Śṛṅgāra, Hāsyā and Karuṇa to Kaiśiki is opposed to the view of the sage Bharata and as such, it is to be discarded. It is interesting to note that nowhere in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* the name of Kohala has been mentioned. Mm. P. V. Kane remarks, "It appears that Kohala's work influenced the redactors of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*".⁶ It may be suggested that the above verse of Kohala found access to some version of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* from which Sāgara-nandin picked it up as the view of the *ācārya*, i.e., Bharata.

It has been shown above that according to Sāgara-nandin, Bhāratī is the Vṛtti of all Rasa-s, and that this is supported by a manuscript of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, (cf. above IV under Rasa-s assigned to Bhāratī). So, the charge of limiting Bhāratī to particular Rasa-s cannot be levelled against Bharata as has been done by Dr V. Raghavan,⁷ simply because the correct reading of the verse concerned is yet to be determined. Of the four views about the ascription of Rasa-s to Bhāratī noted above as available from the different readings of a verse of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, Kohala agrees with the third one ; Sāgara-nandin refers to the second and third views but himself supports the fourth one that speaks of Bhāratī as the

Vṛtti of all Rasas. Dhanañjaya also maintains that Bhārati is the all-pervading Vṛtti and Viśvanātha simply repeats what is said by Dhanañjaya.⁸ Śiṅga-bhūpāla too, maintains the same view and says ; *bhāratyāḥ sarva-rasa-sādhāraṇyam-upa-pannam-eva*.⁹

Now, in the *Nāṭya-vyāpāra* Bhārati has been recognised as the *vāg-vyāpāra* by all theorists. Without Bhārati then, *nāṭya* can be comprehended as nothing more than the dumb show. So, Bhārati should be recognised as the Vṛtti of any and every Rasa. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* rightly observes : *sarva-rūpaka-bhāvitvād rasānām ca vāgjanyatvāt sarvarasātmakatvam*¹⁰ (*bhāratyāḥ*), i.e., Bhārati consists of all the Rasa-s, because it pervades the entire play and the Rasa-s are due to speech.

Broadly speaking, two distinct views are available in the *Nāṭya-śāstra* regarding the ascription of Rasa-s to Sāttvatī. The divergent readings, however, give three views as shown above. But they all agree in assigning the Vīra and Adbhuta to Sāttvatī. Abhinava-gupta appears to accept the first view that recognises Sāttvatī as the Vṛtti of Vīra, Adbhuta and Śānta. The second view omits Śānta and includes Raudra in its place. This is the opinion of Kohala and Sāgara-nandin. It is to be noted here that neither Kohala nor Sāgara-nandin recognises the Śānta-rasa. Like Sāgara-nandin, Śiṅga-bhūpāla also ascribes this view to Bharata.^{10a} It is also to be noted that in the definition of the Sāttvatī, as discussed before, the *Nāṭya-śāstra* (GOS) also says that Sāttvatī is, —*vīrāddhuta-raudra-rasā*. The protagonists of the third view appear to have avoided the controversy and accepted Sāttvatī as the Vṛtti of Vīra and Adbhuta. Abhinava-gupta himself recognises this difference of opinions. While commenting on *sāttvatī cāpi...śamāśrayā* (quoted above), he remarks that those who recognise Śānta-rasa read *śamāśrayā*, but those who do not, they replace Ś by S¹¹, i.e., they read *samāśrayā*. It is to be remembered in this connection that Śama, according to some theorists is the Sthāyi-bhāva of the Śānta-rasa.

In the definition of the Sāttvatī, as noted above, Sāgara-nandin further states that this Vṛtti is *svalpa-karuṇa-śṛṅgāra*,¹² i.e. Sāttvatī comprises Karuṇa and Śṛṅgāra to a lesser degree. The KM. edition of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* accepts this reading and Dr M. M. Ghosh also supports.¹³ These two features of the Sāttvatī have been illustrated in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* as quoted below :

alpa-karuṇa yathā :

*vivṛddhātmāpyagādho'pi duranto'pi mahānapi |
vāḍavenaha jaladhīḥ śokaḥ krodhena piyate ||*

svalpa-śṛṅgāro yathā :

*priye tāvanna netrābhyāṃ pāsyāmyadya tavānanam
na dṛṣṭo yāvadaśrūṇi vamanī ripu-yoṣitām ||¹⁴*

It is apparent that neither Karuṇa nor Śṛṅgāra is manifested in the above, it is Krodha that dominates over the both. Śoka and Śṛṅgāra in cases like the above can be said to attain nothing more than the status of the Vyabhicārin-s. The definition of Sāttvatī as accepted in the GOS. edition of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, specifically prohibits Śṛṅgāra, Karuṇa and Nirveda in Sāttvatī (*nirasta-śṛṅgāra-karuṇa-nirveda*). In this context Abhinava-gupta remarks that there may be cases where in Sāttvatī Śṛṅgāra, Karuṇa and Nirveda may occur but never in a manifested state like Krodha, Viṣmaya and Utsāha.¹⁵ The expressions *alpa-karuṇa* and *svalpa-śṛṅgāra* together with the above two illustrations also suggest the same.

From the descriptions of the Kaiśikī by different theorists, as observed before, it appears that there is no difference of opinions so far as the ascription of Śṛṅgāra and Hāsyā to this Vṛtti. A version of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*, as shown above, includes Karuṇa also as the Rasa of Kaiśikī, and this is the view of Kohala and Sāgara-nandin. Śiṅga-bhūpāla informs us that this is also the opinion of Rudraṭa, but he himself does not favour the idea of ascribing Karuṇa to Kaiśikī.^{15a} Abhinava-

gupta seems to maintain that Karuṇa having wailing as its feature, is to be ascribed to Bhāratī and that the view of Kohala in this respect is opposed to that of Bharata, and as such, is to be discarded.¹⁶ The second argument of Abhinavagupta is a bit dogmatic. Śṛṅgāra is undoubtedly the Rasa of Kaiśikī, and Hāsyā a derived Rasa from Śṛṅgāra as the *Nāṭya-śāstra* maintains,¹⁷ certainly belongs to Kaiśikī. Karuṇa with Śoka as its *sthāyī-bhāva* cannot be said to be compatible with Kaiśikī. But Karuṇa-vipralambha is a subdivision of the Śṛṅgāra itself and is fit to be ascribed to Kaiśikī. Thus Karuṇa cannot be taken as totally incongruous with Kaiśikī.

It has been shown before that two views are available regarding the Rasa-s of Ārabhaṭī from the readings of the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. The first view that ascribes Raudra and Bhayānaka to Ārabhaṭī is shared by Kohala and Sāgara-nandin. The second view adds Bībhatsa with Raudra and Bhayānaka.

Sāgara-nandin seems to lack consistency in his observations on the topic of the Rasa-s of Ārabhaṭī. So far as the general principle of ascription of Rasa-s to different Vṛtti-s are concerned, he follows Kohala but defines Ārabhaṭī as,— *vīra-raudrādbhutātmikā*, and Sampheta a form of Ārabhaṭī as,— *vīra-raudrādbhutaprāyair...* Again, in a third occasion he points out that the *dipta-rasas* like Raudra, Bhayānaka and Bībhatsa belong to Bhāratī and Ārabhaṭī¹⁸. Bhāratī is the Vṛtti of all Rasa-s. Raudra, Bhayānaka and Bībhatsa also fit in well with the characteristics of Ārabhaṭī. But Vīra and Adbhuta are said to be the Rasa-s of Sāttvatī. These two Rasa-s cannot be taken as compatible with Ārabhaṭī that consists much of deceit, treachery, etc., which are opposed to Vīra and Adbhuta.

Most of the later theorists appear to have avoided the above controversial points in pointing out only the undisputed main Rasa-s of each Vṛtti. Thus Dhanañjaya assigns Śṛṅgāra to Kaiśikī, Vīra to Sāttvatī, Raudra to Ārabhaṭī and all Rasa-s to Bhāratī. Viśvanātha simply repeats what is said by

Dhanañjaya.¹⁹ Śiṅga-bhūpāla informs us that some scholars explain the Bharatan verse that distributes Rasa-s to the Vṛttis as simply a general rule and that they accept no binding regulation in this matter :—

kecittu tām imaṃ ślokaṃ bhāratīyaṃ niyāmakam /
prāyikābhiprāyatayā vyācakṣāṇā vicakṣāṇāḥ ||
āsāṃ rase tu vṛttināṃ niyāmakam nānuma (nya ? nva)-te²⁰

The Viṣṇudharmottara also maintains that the Bhāratī is *vāk-pradhāna*, Sāttvati is *vira-rasa-prāyā*, Ārabhaṭī is *raudra-pracārā* and Kaiśiki is *śṛṅgārahāsyā-bahulā*.²¹

IV. Vṛtti and Rīti

The *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa* recognises only three Rīti-s ; Gauḍī, Vaidarbhī and Pāñcālī and distributes the Vṛtti-s to these three. It assigns Bhāratī to all the Rīti-s, Sāttvati to Pāñcālī, Kaiśikī to Vaidarbhī and Ārabhaṭī to Gauḍī.¹ The work avoids the exposition of Rīti-s. Sāgara-nandin remarks in this connection that the exposition of Rīti-s is to be done in the *kāvyamīmāṃsā* and that here it is avoided for fear of the work becoming too long.² From the manner of putting, it appears that Sāgara-nandin himself intended to discuss Rīti in a separate work entitled *Kāvyā-mīmāṃsā* or in a section on the science of poetics. But neither any such work or section nor any reference there to is known to us. The above statement may, however, be taken to mean simply that the present work deals with dramaturgy and it is fit to treat Rīti in a separate work.

There is no reference to the theory of regional distribution of Rīti-s in the *Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa*. It may be noted here that the concept of Rīti is absent in the *Nāṭya-śāstra*. Probably, the concept developed later and in its origin it was associated with regional literary manners.

The concept of Rīti is mainly concerned with language, more properly with diction and as such, has got very little

to do with drama or representation (*abhinaya*) in general. Of the four *Vṛtti*-s, *Bhāratī* is the speech. So, *Bhāratī* alone is primarily related to the *Rīti*-s. This is exactly what *Sāgara-nandin* means when he assigns all the *Rīti*-s to *Bhāratī*. It has been shown before that *Sāgara-nandin* assigns all the *Rasa*-s also to *Bhāratī* and asserts that all other *Vṛtti*-s are united to *Bhāratī*. This is significant. *Bhāratī* is the speech and drama without speech is a mere dumb show. Three other *Vṛtti*-s are certainly to depend on the *Bhāratī* for representation. Now, *Vaidarbhī* according to the rhetoricians is the *Rīti* per-excellence. So, it may reasonably be connected with *Bhāratī* qualified by *Kaiśikī*. In excellence, *Pāñcālī* comes next to *Vaidarbhī* and can be linked up with *Bhāratī* cum *Sāttvatī*. Similarly, when *Bhāratī* is qualified by the forceful *Ārabhaṭī*, it can be taken as associated with the vigorous *Rīti Gaudī*. This appears to be the opinion of *Sāgara-nandin*. He divides *Rasa*-s into three groups³, viz., delicate or tender (*mṛdu*), inflamed (*dīpta*) and moderate (*madhyama*), and shows the co-relation of these three with *Vṛtti*-s and *Rīti*-s in the following way :

- i) The *Rasa*-s of the *mṛdu* group are *Śṛṅgāra*, *Hāsyā* and *Karuṇā*, and they belong to *Bhāratī* cum *Kaiśikī* and come under the *Vaidarbha-rīti* (*rāseṣu śṛṅgāra-kāruṇya-hāsa mṛdavaḥ bhāratī-kaiśikī-vṛtti-viśayāḥ vaidarbha-rītibhājah*).
- ii) The *Raudra*, *Bībhatsa* and *Bhayānaka* are *dīpta* *Rasa*-s (*dīptāḥ raudra-bībhatsa-bhayānakāḥ*). They have been assigned to *Bhāratī* cum *Ārabhaṭī* (*bhāratyārabhaṭī-viśayāḥ*) and *Gaudī* is their *Rīti* (*gauda-rīti-bhājah*).
- iii) The third group, i.e., *madhyama* consisting of *Vīra* and *Adbhuta* (*madhyamau vīrādbhutau*) has been ascribed to *Bhāratī* cum *Sāttvatī* (*bhāratī-sāttvatī-viśayau*). The *Rīti* of this group is *Pāñcālī* (*pāñcāla-rīti-bhājāvīti*).

V. Nature and Mutual Relation of the Vṛtti-s

The *Nāṭya-śāstra* says that the Vṛtti-s are the *nāṭya-mātarāḥ*, and that the ten types of plays (*daśa-rūpa*) have been evolved out of them through production (*prayoga*).¹ Sāgara-nandin describes Vṛtti as : *nepathye (a?) gīta-vāḍita-rasa-bhāvābhinava (ya?) nṛtta-jātīnām kvāpi viśeṣe vartanam iti vṛttiḥ kathita* !.^{1a} According to this description, Vṛtti in dramaturgy signifies a distinctive way of using the elements of *nāṭya* which are costume and make-up, both vocal and instrumental music, dance and expression of different emotions and feelings through acting (*abhinaya*). Dress, make-up, dance, music, etc., in drama are used in a distinctive way. Similarly, in our day-to-day life a particular feeling or sentiment is expressed in certain ways, but in *nāṭya* it should be expressed in a dramatic way. This description of Vṛtti has been taken up by Śubhaṅkara in his *Saṅgīta-dāmodara*.²

Sāgara-nandin further says : *athavā vilāsa-vinyāsa-kramo vṛttir-iti*, i.e., Vṛtti is the manner of arrangement of *vilāsa*. This definition of Vṛtti is exactly the same as is found in the *Kāvya-mīmāṃsā* of Rājaśekhara.³ It is obvious that the word *vilāsa* is not used here in its technical sense to denote either an *aṅga* of the second Sandhi or a *mahāguṇa* of the *nāyaka* or a *ceṣṭālamkāra* of the *nāyikā*. The context shows that the word is to be taken here to mean action in general. Bhojaraāja also means the same when he says that Vṛtti is : *ceṣṭā-viśeṣa-vinyāsa-kramah*.⁴ Abhinava-gupta defines Vṛtti-s as mental, physical and verbal actions arranged in a suitable manner (*kāya-vān-manasām ceṣṭā eva sahavaicitryeṇa vṛttayah*).⁵ In a drama actions are to be arranged dramatically so that æsthetic pleasure can be evoked in the mind of the audience. The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* defines Vṛtti as : *puruṣārtha-sādhako vicitra-vyāparo vṛttiḥ*.⁶ *Puruṣārtha* signifies the ultimate goal of the plot of the play concerned. According to Indian tradition drama ends with the realisation of the fruit (*phala-yoga*) and religious merit (*dharma*), material gain (*artha*)

and success in love affairs (*kāma*) are regarded as fruits in this context. The said work further elucidates the point and says that all the dramatic actions (*nāṭya-vyāpara*) are always related with acting which is expressive of *Rasa-s* and *Bhava-s*.⁶ This is what Abhinava-gupta means to say as stated above.

The *Daśa-rūpaka*, as interpreted by Dhanika, defines *Vṛtti* as the actions of the hero.⁷ This definition is undoubtedly a narrow one, of course the actions of / for the hero in a play preponderate. Viśvanātha includes the actions of all characters when he defines *Vṛtti* as the *vyāpāra-viśeṣa* of the heroine and others (*nāyikādi*).⁸

Drama is the imitation of human actions. The playwright delineates these actions in a particular form and manner in his work. The actors and actresses also represent these actions in a particular way and this is called acting (*abhinaya*). Indian theorists divide this *abhinaya* into four forms, viz., speech (*vācika*), gestures and postures etc. (*āṅgika*), certain emotional expression (*sāttvika*) and dress, make-up and accessories (*āhārya*). Drama or *abhinaya* consists of actions both verbal (*vāg-vyāpāra*) and physical (*kāya-vyāpara*) with both of which the mental action (*mānasa-vyāpāra*) is related to as the guiding factor. Now, the all-pervading *Bhārati* is speech, i.e., verbal action which is called *vācikābhinaya*. In the context of *Vṛtti* physical actions may conveniently be grouped into the following categories according to the situations represented :

There are subtle physical actions which represent certain emotions and are known in Indian dramaturgy as *sāttvikābhinaya*. This form of *abhinaya* comes under *Sāttvati-Vṛtti*.

Some physical actions in *abhinaya* are vigorous and forceful and it is the *Ārabhaṭi-Vṛtti* that stands for this aspect of *abhinaya*.

The mild *Kaiśiki-vṛtti* includes all sorts of graceful and gay physical actions.

The last two groups of physical actions in Sanskrit drama-

turgy are known as *āṅgikābhinaya*, and this *abhinaya* consists of clearly perceptible gestures and postures. Broadly speaking, *sāttvikābhinaya* also consists of physical actions, and a question may be raised here why in Indian dramaturgy it is differentiated from the *āṅgikābhinaya* and is brought under a separate head. A counter argument may also be poised here. Why then *vācīkābhinaya* is a separate form? It is also physical action in a sense. *Sāttvikābhinaya* as the term implies signify mental action. It is true that there is no such action in drama or *abhinaya* that may be called mental from the viewpoint of the experience of the audience. They hear dialogues and see gestures and postures, dress, make up etc. But any one who has got some experience in *abhinaya*, knows well that no action, physical or verbal, is possible without conscious mental ones, i.e., excluding those which in psychology are known as voluntary and reflex actions. Every action in *abhinaya* must be clearly determined. In a word, mental actions guide the physical ones in theatre. In *abhinaya* we see and also hear, i.e. we experience physical and verbal actions (*kāya-vyāpāra*, *vāg-vyāpāra*). But in *abhinaya* there are very subtle physical actions too which are neither gross enough to be clearly viewed, nor so easy to be represented. But this is real *abhinaya*. This aspect of *abhinaya* represents subtle emotions, and this is why in Indian dramaturgy it is classed under a separate name *sāttvikābhinaya*. This is more connected with mental action (*mānaso-vyāpāraḥ*) than gross physical actions. Abhinava-gupta has given a hint to the point in explaining *sattva* of the *Sāttvatī* as mental affair and this has already been noted above in connection with the exposition of *Sāttvatī-Vṛtti*. Now, the fourth form of *abhinaya*, i.e., the *āhārya* consists of costume, make-up and accessories. It is a matter of common sense that this aspect of *abhinaya* is related to all the four *Vṛtti*-s and also to other forms of *abhinaya*. Thus the entire field of *abhinaya* is covered by the four *Vṛtti*-s and that is why the *Nāṭya-śāstra* calls them the mothers of *nāṭya*.

In *nāṭya* the four *Vṛtti*-s are interdependent. They are mutually associated, independent existence of a particular *Vṛtti* in *nāṭya* is not feasible. Thus, without verbal action, i.e., *Bhāratī* no drama or its representation can be conceived of, of course if it is not a dumb show. Similarly, without physical and emotional actions verbal action is nothing but recitation. In drama, the verbal action pervades all other actions. When any one of these interdependent actions get prominence we call it the scope of a particular *Vṛtti*. The point has been hinted at by *Sāgara-nandin* when he remarks that in four *Vṛtti*-s *Bhāratī*, *Sāttvati*, *Kaiśiki* and *Ārabhaṭi* the speech, emotion, grace and physical action respectively predominate (*yathā-kramam ca vāk-sattva-līlā-vyāyāma-pradhānāḥ*).⁹ But when in elucidation of this remark he says, *āhāryam kaiśikyām*,¹⁰ i.e., *āhārya* predominates in *Kaiśiki*, it sounds inconsistent. Dress, make-up and accessories are meant by *āhārya* which we know are related to all the *Vṛtti*-s. Special importance of *āhārya* in a particular *Vṛtti* cannot be conceded to. *Abhinava-gupta* has made the whole point clear. He says: *anyonyam samvalitā vṛttayaḥ kevalam kvacit kiṃcid adhikam iti prādhānyena vyapadeśaḥ parivartate*.¹¹ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* also recognises that the *Vṛtti*-s are mutually associated in drama and that the prominence of one above others in a particular portion of a play is the reason behind the ascription of that portion to that particular *Vṛtti*.¹²

Bhāratī, as we have seen, is the *vāg-vyāpāra* and is related to all the *Rasas* and *Rīti*-s. It pervades the entire play and it is only with the assistance of this *vāg-vyāpāra* that all other *vyāpāra*-s, i.e., *Vṛtti*-s get scope of representation. But to some later authorities beginning from *Dhanika*, this characteristic of *Bhāratī* has been lost sight of. They restrict the scope of *Bhāratī* to the prologue (*Prastāvanā*) only. *Dhanika* admits that *Bhāratī* is speech (*śabda-vṛtti*), but curiously enough he maintains that it is concerned to prologue and is to be discussed in that context (*āmukhasaṅgatvāt tatraiva vācyā*).¹³ *Śiṅga-bhūpāla* more emphatically asserts that

Bhāratī is : *prastāvanopayogitvāt sāṅgam tatraiva lakṣyate*.¹⁴ According to the *Daśa-rūpaka*, the Sthāpaka-sūtradhāra after Pūrva-raṅga enters the stage to perform Prastāvanā and recites a verse containing hints to the plot of the play concerned. He may also describe a season and adopts the Bhāratī.¹⁵ Prastāvanā thus, is not included in the Pūrva-raṅga and it begins with the Bhāratī. From this Dhanika arrives at the conclusion that Bhāratī is restricted to Prastāvanā.

The root of the above misconception is not easy to be found out. The *Nāṭya-śāstra* nowhere specifically says whether the Prastāvanā is included in Pūrva-raṅga or not. But Prarocanā, an *aṅga* of the Bhāratī is recognised as the same of the Pūrva-raṅga.¹⁶ Other three *aṅga*-s of the Bhāratī are Āmukha, Vithī and Prahasana. Āmukha is another name of Prastāvanā.¹⁷ Vithī and Prahasana are two separate types of play (*rūpaka*) of minor type (*apūrṇāṅga*). The *aṅga*-s of Vithī can be employed in Prahasana also, so says the *Nāṭya-śāstra*.¹⁸ It is Mātrgupta who, as reported by Rāghava-bhaṭṭa, recommends : *svair-aṅgair-cāpi vithyāṅgaiḥ prakuryād amukhaṃ budhaḥ*, i.e., some of the *aṅga*-s of the Vithī can be employed in the Āmukha too. Sāgara-nandin quotes the entire verse without, however, mentioning the name of the source. Dhanañjaya also maintains the same opinion.¹⁹ Of the five *aṅga*-s of Prastāvanā, two (Udghātyaka and Avalogita) are *aṅga*-s of the Vithī also. Sāgara-nandin further recommends, certainly on the authority of the above view of Mātrgupta, the employment of Nālikā (another *aṅga* of Vithī) in Āmukha.²⁰ Thus it appears that all the *aṅga*-s of Bhāratī are connected with Pūrva-raṅga and Āmukha, mainly with the latter. Dr Raghavan rightly suggests that this tempted some later theorists to restrict Bhāratī to Prastāvanā only.²¹ He offers another explanation. In the primary stage of the development of drama, there were dumb-shows having three Vṛtti-s of physical action only. Bhāratī was used in those shows in the form of prayers and introductory speeches by Sūtradhāras. This, Dr Raghavan maintains, explains

why Bhāratī has been restricted to the prologue only and called *strī-varjitā* and *saṃskṛta-pāṭha-yutā*. In plain words, in the evolution of drama, speech element came after physical actions, and at the primary stage it was limited to prologues or introductions of the shows, and this is the reason why some theorists were tempted to restrict Bhāratī to prologue only.

It is an accepted theory that dance preceded speech in the evolution of drama proper. But later theorists who restrict Bhāratī to prologue cannot be credited as conscious of that evolution. They have simply followed the earlier works. But neither the *Nāṭya-śāstra* nor any other commentator like Abhinava-gupta, anywhere specifically states that Bhāratī is restricted to Prastāvanā. Abhinava-gupta, as has been noted before, draws a distinction between Prarocanā and Āmukha of Bhāratī and those of the prologue. It is more probable that Dhanika simply failed to understand the view of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* if he had any access to the same. Other theorists like Śiṅga-bhūpāla simply followed Dhanika. It is more interesting to note that the *Daśa-rūpaka* itself does not specifically state that Bhāratī is restricted to prologue. It discusses Bhāratī in connection with the prologue, and this may be taken as due to the identity of the *aṅga*-s of both. Dhanañjaya perhaps means to say that as the play proper begins with Prarocanā where there may be a reference to the story and as the same is an *aṅga* of the Bhāratī the Sūtradhāra is to adopt Bhāratī herefrom. Moreover, the necessity of a Sūtradhāra to introduce or interpret does not arise without a plot, i.e., well arranged story. So, it is difficult to accept with Dr Raghavan the existence of the presentation of such stories without words through the medium of dancing prior to the existence of drama proper. On the other hand, the prevalence of such shows presupposes drama with dialogue. Any way, the root of the above misconception regarding the scope of Bhāratī lies primarily in the sameness of its *aṅga*-s with those of the prologue.

The standpoint of the *Nāṭya-śāstra* regarding the scope of Bhāratī has been clearly explained by Abhinava-gupta. He means to say that as speech the Bhāratī pervades the entire drama (*trailokya-vyāpinyā hi bhāratyāḥ*); Prarocanā and Āmukha are parts of it (*kaścid-aṁśaḥ prarocanā-rūpaḥ, evam āmukha-svabhāva ityādi*).²² Moreover, as has been noted before, according to Abhinava-gupta chief characteristics only have been mentioned in Bharata's definitions of Vṛtti-s. There Bhāratī is defined as *strī-varjitā saṁskṛta-pāṭha-yuktā*. This is simply to give scope to the chief characteristics of Kaiśikī, as Abhinava-gupta puts it : *strī-varjiteti kaiśikī-prādhānyāvākāśaṁ gamayati*. In Kaiśikī female characters predominate. The gracefulness of their Prakrit speeches (*prākṛta-pāṭhya-lālityāt*) also indicate Kaiśikī (*kaiśikīm avaśyam ākṣipet*).²³ The *Nāṭya-darpaṇa* makes the point more clear. It says that Bhāratī begins from Prarocanā and Āmukha where generally Sanskrit is found to predominate, but it pervades the entire drama even in cases of Prakrit speeches.²⁴ Sāgara-nandin also admits of this all-pervading character of Bhāratī as has already been discussed.

NOTES AND REFERENCES

Chapter I

- 1 DR. I. 7.
- 2 NLRK. II. 8-11. The NŚ. (GOS. XV. 126; XVI. 5) uses *Kāvya* and *Nāṭya* as synonyms.
- 3 NLRK. II. 266 ; II. 2283-2284.
- 4 NLRK. II. 267-268. The verse, as it is, does not occur in any of the present versions of the NŚ. The first half is undoubtedly the same as that of V. No. 142 of 19th chap. of the NŚ. (GOS) and the second half seems to be similar to that of V. No. 144 of the same chapter. Rucipati in his com. on the An. rā. (p. 9) attributes the verse to Bharata and reads *tadīyānukṛtiḥ* in place of *tasyāstva-bhinayaḥ*.
- 5 DR I. 7. *avasthā-nukṛtir-nāṭyam*.
- 6 NLRK I. 269 and. II. 2282-2285.
- 7 NŚ. GOS. I. 15.
- 8 NŚ. GOS. I. 17; NLRK. II. 17-18.
- 9 NŚ. GOS. I. 116 ; XIX. 143.
- 10 NLRK. II. 25-26. The verse is also found in the Bhāpra. (p. 222, II. 16-17) where the reading of the first half is : *apī sidhyeta viduṣām* etc. Śaṅkara in his Ra. ca. (Abhi-śaku. p. 116) attributes the verse to Prajāpati. Another verse on the eulogy of Nāṭaka and attributed to Pitāmaha by Sāgara (NLRK. II. 15-16) is also found in the said work and also in the Tippanī of Narahari in the same context as belonging to Prajāpati (Abhi-śaku, p. 116 and p. 296). This verse also, is found in the Bhāpra. p. 238. II. 2-3. Dr Raghavan informs that Bahrūpa Miśra in his gloss on the DR. reproduces the entire portion of the NLRK. II. 14-26. NLRK. Eng. Tra., p. 60.

The NS. itself and Abhi-bhā refer to Brahma in several places.

- 11 NLRK. I. 2173.
- 12 NS. GOS. XIX. 1, *itivṛttam tu nālyasya śarīram parikīrtitām.*
- 13 DR. I. 15-16; Bhā-pra. p. 203, ll. 13-15; RS. III, 5-6.
- 14 NC. p. 3.
- 15 NS. GOS. vol. II P. 411 : *upādhāyā ittham ahuḥḥiha trividhayā prasiddhyā prasiddhatvaṃ bhavati, amuka evaṃkārī amutra deśa iti.* cf., ND. p. 24.
- 16 NLRK. II. 32-33. *prakhyāta-vastuviśayam. prakhyātodātta-nāyakam/rājarṣi-vaṃśa-caritaṃ tathā divyāśrayotthitaṃ*|| The NS. (GOS. XVIII. 10) reads : *divyāśrayopetaṃ* instead of *divyāśrayotthitaṃ* of the NLRK., *divyāśrayopetaṃ* according to Abhinavagupta means, 'having divine helpers' Cf., Abhi-bhā. NS. GOS. Vol. II. P. 412. Full gloss on the expression *divyāśrayotthitaṃ* in the NLRK. is missing. The NLRK. only says, *divyānām maheśvara-jimūtavāhanādīnām caritaṃ* (ll. 45-46) and then that there is a gap in the ms. as suspected by Edgerton, informs Dr Raghavan. NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 71.
- 17 NLRK. II. 44-45, l. 2189.
- 18 NLRK. II. 39-44.
- 19 NLRK. II. 47-50. Śaṅkara in his Ra. ca. on the Abhi-śaku (p. 162) seems to have quoted from the NLRK. when he remarks : *upāttam pratisaṃskṛtam ceti vṛttadva-yam.* Here Śaṅkara quotes : *pañca pañca catuḥ-ṣaṣṭiś-catuh pañcaika-vimśati/ṣaḍvimśa-navatiryatra tadāhurnātakam budhāḥ*|| *ṣaḍvimśa* is obviously a corrupt reading : it should be *ṣaṭ-trimśat*, as in the exposition of the verse Śaṅkara himself states. The verse occurs in the NLRK. (ll. 1858-1859). Here the reading is *aṣṭaika-vimśati*. Bhā-pra. (p. 222, ll. 8-9) gives the verse with the reading found in the Ra-ca. The verse concerned is not Sgn.'s own, as he introduces it (l. 1857) saying *ata evocyate*. At the conclusion of his exposition on the verse Śaṅkara

says, *etacca vistareṇa ratnakoṣe kathitam*. This *ratnakoṣa* is undoubtedly the NLRK. Other instances of Śaṅkara's borrowing from the NLRK. will be shown in due course.

- 20 The Social play in Sanskrit by Dr Raghavan, p. 2.
- 21 Bhā-pra. p. 234, ll. 21-22. *pūrva-vṛttā-śrayam-api kiñcid-utpādyavastu ca vidheyam nāṭakam-iti mātṛguptena bhāṣitam ||*
- 22 NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 60.
- 23 Abhi-śaku. p. 9. It is apparent that Mg.'s description of Nāṭaka does not vary materially from that of the NS. First three lines of the above description appear to have been taken directly from the NŚ. (GOS., XVIII. 10,11). Ninth line carries the same sense as is contained in v. no. 12 in the said chap. of the NŚ. The NŚ. does not specifically state anything regarding the main Rasa of a Nāṭaka while Mātṛgupta enjoins that either Śṛṅgāra or Vīra should be the main Rasa (1.4 in above quotation). Later authorities perhaps, are influenced by this dictum of Mātṛgupta (Cf., Bhā-pra. p. 233. 1.3 ; RS. III. 131 ; SD. VI. 10). Fifth and sixth lines of above quotation are found in the RS. III. 132.
- 24 RS. III. 161.
- 25 DR. III. 24-25 and Avaloka ; ND. I. 18 ; Bhā-pra. p. 233. 1.22. p. 234 1.1 ; SD. VI. 50 and below.
- 26 ND. p. 25.
- 27 NLRK. 1.34. NŚ. GOS. XVIII. 11. *nānā-vibhūtibhīr-jutamṛddhi-vilāsādirguṇaiśca.....||*
- 28 NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 60.
- 29 Bhā-pra. p. 200, 1.18.
- 30 NLRK. 11. 51-53.
- 31 NŚ. GOS. I. 19. *itihāsa mayā sṛṣṭaḥ* etc. Abhi. bhā. on it says, *itihāso daśa-rūpakam*.
- 32 NŚ. GOS. I. 57. *yathā daityāḥ surair-jitāḥ*.
- 33 NŚ. GOS. vol. I. P. 27. *prabhu-paritoṣāya prabhu-caritam kadācinnāṭye varṇanīyam-iti yathā daityāḥ surair-jitā ityetas-*

māl-labhyata iti kecidāhuḥ|tadasat|.. na ca vartamāna-caritā-nukāro yuktaḥ|vineyānām tatra rāga-dveṣa-madhyasthatādinā tanmayī-bhāvābhāve prīterabhāvena vyutpatter-apyabhāvāt|

34. NŚ. GOS. Vol. II. P. 413. *tena vartamāna-rāja-caritaṃ ca avarṇanīyam eva, tatra viparīta-prasiddhi-bādhayā adhyā-roṇasya akiñcitkaratvāt.....|etadarthameva prakhyāta-gra-haṇaṃ prakarṣa-dyotakaṃ punaḥ punarupāttam |*

35. NŚ. GOS. Vol. II. P. 412. *naca sarvathā deva-caritam tathā avarṇanīyam|.....prakarī-pāṭākā-nayakādi-rūpeṇa..... aṅgī-karaṇam.....*

yadi tu mukhyatvenaiva deva-caritam varṇyate tat-tāvadvi-pralambha-karuṇādbhuta-bhayānaka-rasocitaṃ cen-nibadhyate taṃ-mānuṣa-caritam-eva sampadyate|.....nāyikā tu divyāpyavirodhinī... |

36. ND. (p. 25) takes king to mean one belonging to the Kṣatriya class and not an actually coronated king, as princes are very often found to be depicted as heroes in Nāṭakas.

37. HSL. Cal. Uni. P. 739.

38. Cf. PHAI. Dr. H. Roy Choudhury, 5th ed., p. 391, "Pushyamitra died in or About 151 B.C. and was succeeded by his son Agnimitra."

39. NŚ. GOS. XVIII. 45-46, and also Abhi-bhā. (p. 430) *anārṣam iti purāṇādi-vyatirikta-br̥hatkathā-dyupanibaddham mūladeva caritādi | āhāryam iti pūrvakavikāvyād-vā-āharaṇīyam samudradatta-ceṣṭitādi |*

40. NŚ. GOS. Vol. II. p. 410. It is to be noted here that Ag., as it appears from the above, is reluctant to admit the Br̥hat-kathā as an *ārṣa* source. This lost work, perhaps, was not the source of the plot of the *Mudrā-rākṣasa*, as we have it. (See HSL. Cal. Uni. p. 265, the remark of Dr. De) Dhanika, however, says (DR. below I-68. p. 34), *br̥hatkathā-mūlam mudrā-rākṣasam*, and quotes two verses which are obviously interpolated from Kṣemendras *Br̥hatkathā-māñjarī* (II. 216, 217) (HSL. p. 265. fn. 2). The story of the defeat of the Nandas through the stratagem of Cāṇakya and the installation

- of Candragupta, however, find mentions in the *Viṣṇu-purāṇa* (IV. 24), *Parīśiṣṭaparvan* (VIII. 253-54) and some other minor works. cf. PHAI. Pp. 265-270.
- 41 Traditional accounts of the fall of the Nandas and the rise of the Mauryas are preserved in the *ārṣa* source like the *Purāṇas* and also in the Buddhist and Jaina works. (See Dr. H. C. Raychoudhury ; PHAI. P. 269). But strictly speaking, neither the fall of the Nandas nor the rise of the Mauryas is the subject-matter of the drama. The entire plot may in a sense, be said to be invented by Viśākhadatta. Moreover, according to Ag. *Bṛhatkathā* is an *anārṣa* source, as pointed out before. How then Ag. himself calls it a *Nāṭaka* cannot be explained.
- 42 Keith, The Skt. Dr. P. 254.
- 43 NŚ. GOS. Vol. II. P. 436. *ghaṇṭakādayastvāhuḥ nāyako nṛpatirityetāvan-mātraṃ nāṭakādāvupajivitaḥ na tu prakhyā-tatvamapi |*
- 44 NLRK. 11.51-52.
- 45 NŚ. GOS. I. 114-115.
- 46 Sāgarikā, 1st. yr., 2nd issue, P. 170.
- 47 NŚ. GOS. XVIII. 12 ; NLRK. 11. 37-38.
- 48 NŚ. GOS. XIX. 1 ; NLRK. 1.216. *itivṛttam hi nāṭyasya śarīraṃ parikīrtitam*
- 49 NŚ. GOS. VI below verse 31. *na hi rasādṛṣṭe kaścidarthaḥ pravarttate*
- 50 NSRK. 11. 1732-1733. *ato'nyathāvṛttiṣu paṇḍiteṣu na daṇḍamākarṣati śāstrakāraḥ |*
- 51 NLRK. 11. 27-30. NŚ. GOS. XIX. 145. also mss. readings given there. The Tippanī of Narahari on the Abhi-śaku (P. 295) reads *nāṭya*. Śaṅkara in his commentary on the same (P. 162) reads the verse as it is found in the NLRK. The *Viṣṇudharmottara-Purāṇa* (Khaṇḍa III, Adhyāya 17, V. No. 7) also says, *caritaṃ tridaśānāṃ vā nāṭakam tatra kīrtitam |*
- 52 NŚ. GOS. XVIII. 10.

53 Cf. Supra. fn. 15.

54 NŚ. GOS. Vol. II. Pp. 411-412.

prakhyāte bhāratādau yad-vastu tadviśayo'sya, tatrāpi kiñcid-aprasiddham bhavati, tan-nirākaraṇāya prakhyāto-dātteti śriṣaṅkukah|...upādhyāyā itthamāhuḥ.....evam tāvad-dve prasiddhe ukte, prakhyāto-dāttetyanena tṛtīyā prasiddhir-uktā|udātta iti vīra-rasa-yagya uktah|| tena dhīralalita-dhīra-prasānta-dhīroddhata-dhīrodāttāḥ catvāro'-pi gṛhyante |

55 LPSD. Vol. I. Pp. 4-5.

56 NŚ. GOS. XXIV. 18-19.

57 NLRK. II. 260-262.

58 NLRK. II. 262-264. The printed text reads : *pādacāreṣu boddhavyāḥ tatra ta iti*. Dr Raghavan rightly suggests that *pādacāreṣu* is a corruption for *upacāreṣu*. NLRK. Eng. Tra. P. 72.

59 NŚ. GOS. Vol. II, P. 414.

60 NŚ. GOS. Vol. II. P. 414. *yat-tu paṭhitam tatra dhīra-lālitatvam rājña eva varṇanīyam nānyasya, senāpatya-mātyayor-dhīrodāttatvam-eva, devānām dhīroddhatatvam-eva, dvijātīnām dhīra-prasāntatvam-eveti, evam param draṣṭavyamata eva prakhyāto-dāttetyatra catvāro'-pi nāyakāḥ svīkṛtā iti vyākhyeyam |*

61 ND. I. 7, cf. also the commentary on p. 26. *eva varṇanīya iti sva-yogavyavasthāpakatvenaivāvadhāryate nānyayogavyavacchedena|*

62 DR. III. 22 ; SD. VI. 9, RS. III. 130.

63 LPSD. P. 4.

64 DR. Avaloka. P. 37.

65 DR. Avaloka. P. 38, *ato jīmūtavāhanāder-dhīrodāttatvam-iti|*

66 ND. P. 26. *ye tu nāṭakasya netāram dhīrodāttam eva pratijānate, na te munisamayādhyavagāhinaḥ, nāṭakeṣu dhīra-lalitādīnām-api nāyakānām darśanāt kavi-samaya-bāhyāśca*. This criticism is solely based on the traditional interpretation of the term Dhīrodātta and the writers seem to have turned a deaf ear to the new interpretation of the term given by Dhanika.

67 Cf. SD. VI. 9 ; NC. P. 2.

Chapter II

- 1 A. B. Keith. The Skt. Dr. P. 297.
- 2 NLRK. II. 54-58. NS. GOS. XIX, 7,8.
- 3 NLRK. I. 102.
- 4 NLRK. II. 103-108.
- 5 NLRK. I. 109, for *Rāghavābhyudaya* see infra. f.n. 8 under Bindu, chap. III.
- 6 NLRK. I. 59. This is after the NS. GOS. XIX. 9. *autsukyamātra-bandhastu yadbijasya nibadhyate/mahataḥ phala-yogasya sa phalārambha iṣyate ||* It is interesting to note that RB. (Abhi-śaku. P. 15) attributes this verse to Ādibharata. Bhā-pra. (P. 206. II. 5-6) gives the same definition.
- 7 NLRK. II. 59-65. The illustration is evidently from a lost Rāma-play and there are two more citations from this *aṅka* in the NLRK. below II. 3094 and 3132.
- 8 Bhā-pra. p. 206. II. 17-18. *śakuntalāyāḥ kṣatreṇa parigrāhya-kṣmatvataḥ ārambho'-saṁśayaṁ kṣatretyādi duṣyanta-bhāṣite||*
- 9 RS. P. 214. III. 23 ; NC. P. 10.
- 10 DR. I. 20 ; SD. VI. 71.
- 11 S. D. P. 354, below VI. 71.
- 12 NS. GOS. Vol. III. P. 6. *pradhānabhūtasya phalasya...tat-tannāyakocitasya yadbijam upāyasampat tasya yadautsukyamātram tadviśaya-smaraṇotkaṇṭhānurūpam...tasya bandho hrdaye nirudhiḥ prārambhaḥ, sa ca nāyakasyāmātyasya nāyikāyāḥ pratināyakasya daivasya vā |*
- 13 ND. P. 44. *phalaṁ mukhyaṁ sādhyam tadarthaṁ autsukyam upāyaviśayam anenopāyenaitat sidhyatīti smaraṇotkaṇṭhādīkarma tadanugūṇo vyāpāraścobhayam ārambhaḥ |*
- 14 NLRK. I. 66. NS. GOS. XIX. 10. RB. attributes (Abhi-śaku. P. 69) this verse to Ādi-bharata.
- 15 NLRK. II. 67-68. There are six more citations from this Act in the NLRK. below II. 205, 942, 1752, 1817,

- 3076, 3112. Dr Raghavan informs us (NLRK. Eng. Tra. P. 61) that *Kulapatyaṅka* is the Act of the lost Rāma play *Udātta-rāghava* of Amoghavarṣa Māyurāja, of which a manuscript has been luckily discovered by him (SOLRP. Intro. P. XIII). It is curious that the name of the drama itself has not been mentioned by Sgn. The Bhā-pra. cites this Aṅka twice (P. 202. l. 1, p. 279. l. 10) which occur also in the NLRK. in the same contexts, (ll. 205-207 ll. 3110 respectively). Śdt. also does not mention the name of the drama. Viśvanātha also cites from the *Kulapatyaṅka* in two cases and both these citations occur in the NLRK. in similar contexts (SD. p. 353 and NLRK. ll. 205-207. SD. p. 420, NLRK. l. 1752). In other two cases where the name of the drama *Udātta-rāghava* has been mentioned the SD. seems to have followed Dhanika (SD. p. 331, DR. p. 63, SD. p. 398, DR. p. 60). Dhanika cites the drama in five cases (pp. 60, 63, 70, 81, 83). The ND. cites the drama twice (pp. 102, 173).
- 16 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 7...*upāya-viśaya-smaraṇecchāsantāna-svabhāvaḥ* |
ND. p. 45. *autsukyamātramārambhaḥ, paramautsukyam prayatna ityārthaḥ* |
- 17 Avaloka, DR. p. 5. *phalasyāprāptāvupāya-yojanādirūpaśceṣṭā-viśeṣaḥ prayatnaḥ* | *yathā ratnāvalyām-ālekhyābhi-lekhanādir-vatsa-rāja-samāgamopāyaḥ* |
- 18 SD. p. 354. VI. 72.
- 19 RS. p. 214, III. 24 ; NC. p. 10.
- 20 Bhā-pra. p. 206, ll. 7-8 and 19-20.
- 21 NLRK. ll. 69-70. NS. GOS. XIX. ll. *iṣatprāptir-yadā kācit phalasya parikalpyate* | *bhāvamātreṇa taṁ prāhurvidhijñāḥ prāpti-sambhavam* ||
- 22 Bhā-pra. p. 206, ll. 9-10.
- 23 NLRK. ll. 70-75. Dr Raghavan informs us that this is the Act IV of the *Udātta-rāghava* (NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 61). This Act has been referred to in the NLRK. below

- l. 388 and l. 964 ; part of a verse from this Act has been cited below l. 1607.
- 24 RS. p. 206, III. 24. *prāptyāśā tu mahārthasya siddhi-sadbhāva-bhāvanā* |
- 25 NC. Pp. 10-11.
- 26 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 7. *bhāvaḥ upāyaḥ, tasya saha-kāryantarayogaḥ pratibandhaka-vāraṇaṃ ca mātra-padenāyadhāritam sambhāvanā-yogyatvamasambhāvanā-viśiṣṭatvaṃ nāma tṛtiyā karturavasthā* |
- 27 Cf. Supra, below Five Avasthās.
- 28 ND. p. 45.
- 29 DR. I. 21. Avaloka. p. 6 ; SD. VI. 72.
- 30 NS. GOS. XIX. 12. *niyatām tu phala-prāptim yadā bhāvena paśyati* | *niyatām tām phala-prāptim saguṇām paricakṣate* || RB. in his *Arthadyotanikā* (Abhi-śaku. Pp. 168-169) attributes the verse to Ādibharata. The Bhā-pra. (p. 206. 11.11-12) also seems to have adopted this description of Niyatāpti but the reading there is corrupt.
- 31 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 7. *sāmagrim yadā...mukhyopāyena niyantritam phalāvyabhicāriṇim paśyati*. ND. p. 46.
- 32 NLRK. 1.76. This is evidently from the NS. excepting the portion “*yadābhāvena*” etc., as quoted above.
- 33 NLRK. 11. 78-81.
- 34 NLRK. 1.83. The NS. counts one Āsmakuṭṭa among hundred sons of Bharata (NS. GOS. I. 33). Like some other Bharataputras Āsmakuṭṭa was perhaps an ancient *ācārya* on dramaturgy. The NLRK. refers to his views in connection with important topics like Niyatāpti as mentioned above and also Cūlikā and Toṭaka below 11. 437 ; 2766, 2775.
- 35 NRLK. 1. 106.
- 36 NLRK. 11, 84-88. On at least twenty four occasions Sgn. refers to the play *Jānakī-rāghava*. The drama appears to have depicted the Rāma story beginning from his forest life up to the recovery of Sitā. From the number of citations from this drama in the NLRK. Dr Raghavan (SOLRP. p. 60) suggests that Sāgara might have had “Some special relation to or interest in this play”. Only

from the number of citations this sort of supposition seems to be unjustified as there are as many as fifty-three citations in the NLRK. itself from the V-sam. But there are other good reasons in favour of Dr Raghavan's suggestion. The drama in question, has been cited only once in the SD. below VI. 98, p. 375. But this also seems to be due to the influence of the NLRK. on the SD. The last half of the whole verse, cited with the name of the source by Viśvanātha, occurs in the NLRK. (ll. 747-748) in the same context as in SD, as an illustration of Anumāna, an *aṅga* of the Garbha-sandhi. Now, the *Jānakī-rāghava*, referred to so many times by Sgn. finds no mention in the Abhi-bhā. DR. ND. Bhā-pra. and RS. Dr Raghavan's above suggestion can very well explain this fact,

- 37 DR. I. 21. Avaloka p. 6.
 38 RS. III. 25, p. 215 ; SD. VI. 73. NC. p. 11.
 39 NLRK. I. 89. NŚ. GOS. XIX. 13, *abhipretam samagram ca pratirūpam kriyāphalam | itivṛtte bhavedyasmin phalayogaḥ prakīrtitaḥ ||* It is interesting to note that RB. attributes (Abhi-śaku, p. 230) this verse to Mātr-gupta. The Bhā-pra. (p. 206, ll. 13-14) reads the third foot of the verse differently.
 40 NLRK. ll. 90-100.
 41 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 8 ; ND. p. 46.
 42 DR. I. 22 ; SD. VI. 73 ; NC. p. 11.
 43 Bhā-pra. p. 159. ll. 11-12. *abhiṣṭārthaparipāko netrā-der athavā kaveḥ | drumādiphalaavad-yatra svādyate tat phalam bhavet ||*
 44 NŚ. GOS. XIX. 5. Abhi-bhā. NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 4. *kaviryaṭ phalam utkarṣeṇa vivakṣati tat pradhānaphalam |*
 45 JOI. Vol. V. No. 4. p. 374.

Chapter III

- 1 NLRK. II. 218-219 ; NS. GOS. XIX. 2.
- 2 NLRK. II. 222-224 ; 228-229 ; NS. GOS. XIX. 3,5.
- 3 NLRK. II. 225-226.
- 4 NLRK. I. 227.. *anyastvāha | kathāyām eva kathāntaram upakāraḥ ānusaṅgikam iti |*
- 5 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 12. *arthah phalaṃ tasya prakṛtayaḥ upāyāḥ phalahetava ityarthah | tadetaiḥ pañchabhīrupāyāiḥ pūrṇaphalaṃ niṣpādyate |* For an exposition of Abhinavas division of Arthaprakṛtis into two groups viz., Inanimate and Animate ; the first comprising the Bija and Kārya while the second comprising other three, see H. K. Trivedi's learned paper on the topic in ABORI, Vol. XLIV. Pts. I-IV, pp. 143-146.
- 6 DR. p. 5 ; SD. p. 351 ; ND. 37.
- 7 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 12 ; RS. p. 209.
- 8 Bhā-pra. p. 204. l. 22 ; p. 205. l. 1.
- 9 Kumārsvāmin in his com. on the PRYB (p. 104) says : *arthaprakṛtayaḥ prayojanasiddhi-hetava iti kecit | kathāśarīrasya kāraṇānti bhoja-rājādayaḥ | Śr.-pra. Vol. II. Chap. XII. p. 48. kathāśarīropādāna-kāraṇabhūtāḥ pañcārthaprakṛtayo bhavanti | arthaprakṛtayaḥ pañca kathādehasya hetavaḥ |* This definition of Bhojadeva also supports our suggestion regarding the reading of the above line of the Bhā-pra.
- 10 NLRK. II. 131-13. Śaṅkara in his *Rasa-candrikā* (p. 162) seems to have followed the NLRK. when he says : *arthasya prakṛtayaḥ svabhāvāḥ.*
- 11 NLRK. II. 132-133. *naitān parityajya nāṭakārthāḥ sambhavanti |*
- 12 NC. p. 9.
- 13 NS. GOS. XIX. 20. *itiṛtte yathāvasthāḥ pañcārambhādikāḥ smṛtāḥ | arthaprakṛtayaḥ pañca tathā bījādikā api ||*
- 14 NS. GOS. III. p. 12.
- 15 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 12. f.n. 1. *idamardham ta-pa-ḍa-da-na-ba-ya mātṛkāsu na vartate |*

16 See Infra (D). Relation among the three pentads.

Bija (Germ)

- 1 NLRK. I. 136. also I. 538. *bijam-nālakasya phalabhūtasya hetuḥ.*
- 2 NLRK. II. 137-138. *kiñcinmātram samuddiṣṭam bahudhā yad-visarpati/yāvat phalāvasānam ca tad-bijam iti kīrtitam ||* NS. GOS. XIX. 22. RB. attributes (Abhi-śaku. p. 15) this definition of Bija to Ādi-bharata. Bhoja also (Śr. pra. Chap. XII. p. 482) defines the Bija as,—*alpa-mātram upakṣiptam bahudhā yad visarpati | phalāvasānam yacca syāt tad bijam iti sañjitam ||*
- 3 DR. I. 17; ND. p. 37. I. 29; Bhā-pra. p. 24. II. 4-5; SD. VI. 65-66; RS. III. 8-9; NC. p. 9.
- 4 NLRK. II. 139-140. *kiñcit stokaṃ śleṣa-chāyopakṣepaprabhṛtivrāṅgaiḥ samuddiṣṭam kathitam |*
- 5 NLRK. II. 144-145.
- 6 NLRK. II. 548-550.
- 7 V-sam. Ed. Jivananda, Calcutta 1934, p. 8.
- 8 NLRK. II. 145-147.
- 9 Dr Sukumar Sen (*Bāṅgālā Sāhityera Itihāsa*, Ed. III, Pt. I. p. 33) and Dr Niharranjan Roy (*Bāṅgālira Itihāsa*, p. 745) maintain that Sāgaranandin's homeland was Bengal.
- 10 Cf. Dr Raghavan, NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 61.
- 11 NLRK. II. 148-152.
- 12 NLRK. II. 154-158. *arthopasthāpana* is not the giving rise to an idea as taken by M. Dillon in his translation of the NLRK. *artha* is plot and *arthopasthāpana* is the act of introducing the plot.
- 13 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 13.
- 14 NLRK. II. 141-143. *anyastvāha/iṣṭārtha-sāadhanam bijam uptam utpatram uddhatam/anviṣṭam phalitam pañcasandhistam darśayet kramāt |* The printed text reads *utpātam* and *pañca-sandhiṣṭām* which may be amended as *utpatram* and

pañcasandhistham respectively, as suggested by Dr Raghavan.

- 15 Bhā-pra. p. 204. ll. 9-10 ; RS. p. 210. III. 9-10. Dhanika (DR. p. 5) also says : *bijavad-bijam*. Bhoja expands this metaphor (Śr. Pra. Chap. XII. p. 482) *yathā bijam uptamaṅkura-mūla - prakāṇḍa - patra-skandha-śākhā-praroha-pallava-puṣpādīnā prakāreṇa bahudhā visarpadante phalāya kalpate tathā yo mahāvākyaārtho nāyakopānāyaka sahāyādī-vyāpārābheda bahudhā visarpanmante phalāya jāyate sa bijam ityucyate* |
- 16 RB. Abhi-śakau. p. 15. *kvacit kāraṇamātram tu kvacicca phaladarśanam | kvacidārambhamātram tu phalam uktvā kriyā kvacit || vyāpāraśca viśeṣoktaḥ kvacidvā phalasādha-kaḥ | bahudhā rūpakeṣvevaṃ bijarūpeṇa dīśyate || phale yasya hi samhāraḥ phalabijam tu tad bhavet | vastu-bijam kathā jñeyā ariha-bijam tu nāyakaḥ ||* Dr Raghavan points out (NLRK. Eng Tra. p. 7) that Raṅganātha in his commentary on the Vik-u. has quoted Mg.'s observation on Bija. But the same is found in the RB's commentary, as given above, and not in the commentary of Raṅganātha on the Vik-u.
- 17 Bhīma is the hero of the V-Sam., though arguments in favour of Yudhiṣṭhira may also be adduced. Śāradātanaya supports the case of Bhīma. Cf. Bhā-pra. p. 207. 1. 2. *bhīmasya veṇīsamhāre phalayogo'tra darśitaḥ* |
- 18 Cf. Abhi-bhā. NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 13. *tatra cakravarttiputralābho munijanāśīrvacana-dvāreṇa phalasvabhāvasyaivabhijñāna-śakuntale* |
- 19 It is not, however, intended to suggest that Mg. actually formulated his theory after a close study of the dramas referred to above. Only the cogency of his thesis has been discussed with reference to the dramas known to us. Mg. might have gone through dramas of similar type.
- 20 Abhi-bhā. NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 13., ND. pp. 37-38.

Bindu (Sign of continuity)

- 1 NLRK. II. 162-163. *prayojanānām vicchede yad aviccheda-kāraṇam | yāvat samāptim kāryasya sa bindur-iti kathyate ||* NS. GOS. XIX. 23, reads the second half as : *yāvat samāptir-bandhasya.....* The verse is quoted in the commentary on the An-rā. (p. 11) by Rucipati, there the reading differs from that of the both above. RB. attributes (Abhi-śaku. p. 69) this verse to Ādi-bharata.
- 2 NLRK. II. 164-165.
- 3 NLRK. II. 166-172.
- 4 Bhā-pra. p. 204. II. 13-14 ; RS. p. 210. III. 11, gives almost a similar definition of Bindu. The DR. also means the same in (I. 17), *avāntarārtha-vicchede bindur-accheda-kāraṇam |* The SD (VI. 66) follows the DR.
- 5 Bhā-pra. p. 204. I. 17.
- 6 NLRK. II. 173-174.
- 7 NLRK. Eng. Tra. Dr. Raghavan's introduction. p. 7. Dr. S. N. Shastri seems to have confused this view with that of Kohola in the statement "Kohola makes the idea very clear when he says that Bindu is that occasional reference to the main motif of action etc." Cf. LPSD. p. 86.
- 8 NLRK. II. 174-182. Rāghavābhyudaya is a lost Rāma-play from which there are as many as fourteen citations in the NLRK. The SD. contains one citation and that also seems to be taken from the NLRK. Cf. NLRK. I. 1796 and SD. (below VI. 210), the illustration of the *alaṅkāra* Nivedana. For details of the drama see SOLRP. p. 74 ff. Rucipati (An-rā. p. 11) also points out that *lākṣāḡṭhānala...* of the V-sam is Mānalakṣaṇo Bindu. M. Dillon (NLRK. p. 69. f.n. 2) informs us that a verse, stated by Sāgara (II. 1660-1663) as taken from the *Rāghavābhyudaya*, is found to be attributed to Viśākhadatta in the *Saduktikarṇāmṛta* (I. 46.5). This may simply be taken to be a case of error and from this the drama cannot be assigned to Viśākhadatta.

- 9 Bhā-pra. p. 204. ll. 15-16.
- 10 NLRK. ll. 183-185.
- 11 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 13. *prayujyate phalaṃ yairupāyā-nuṣṭhānaiḥ teṣāṃ itivṛtta-vaśād-avaśyakartavyatādibhir-vicchede 'pi sati yadanu-sandhānātmakam pradhāna-nāyaka-gatam sandhi-dravyajñānam binduḥ* | The reading *pradhāna-nāyaka gatam* seems to be questionable. Abhinava himself says that the connection may be established by the efforts of the ministers of the hero, as will be shown forthwith.
- 12 Abhi-bhā. NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 14 ; Cf. ND. p. 41.
- 13 Cf. supra, f.n. 4.
- 14 Abhinava also seems to have partially supported this view when regarding the Bindu (NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 14) he says : *tathā hi tāpasa-vatsarāje vāsavadattā-premanu-sandhānam rājamukhena pratyāṅkam darśitam* |
- 15 NS. GOS. Vol. II. p. 423. *pratyāṅkāntam yo binduḥ anu-sandhānābhidhāyi-vākyam* | Cf. ND. p. 31, *purvottara-yoraṅkayoḥ-asumbaddhārthatvaṃ mā bhūd-iti pūrvāṅkasyānte bindur-nibandhaniyaḥ* | DR. III. 37. *bindur-ante tu bijavat*. This also seems to be the view of Kohala. Śdt. (Bhā-pra. p. 236. l. 18) records that Kohala prescribes the use of Bindu at the close of an Aṅka (*bindurante ca*).
- 16 Cf. Mā-ag. Bombay Sanskrit series no. 6. 1889.
- 17 NLRK. ll. 159-161. Bhoja maintains a similar idea, Śr. pra. (Vol. II), p. 482.
- 18 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 14, *tailabinduvat sarvavyāpakatvāt* / Dhanika, (DR. p. 5) *bindurjale tailabinduvat prasāritvāt* |
- 19 An-rā. p. 11, *tailabinduryathā toye svaśaktyā vyāpya tiṣṭhati* | *kāvyaṅgāni tathā binduḥ saṃdarśya mukhyatā (ām ?) vrajet* ||
- 20 RS. p. 210. III. 12.

Patākā (Episode)

- 1 Dhanika DR. p. 4 ; Bhā-pra. (p. 201. ll. 11-12) includes Patākā-sthānaka also as a subdivision of the Prāsaṅgika

vṛtta. The matter will be taken up in connection with our discussion on the Patākāsthānakas.

- 2 NLRK. II. 186-188.
- 3 Abhi-bhā. NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 15. *patākāvad upayogitvādiyaṃ patāketi cirantanāḥ* /
- 4 Avaloka. DR. p. 4 ; RS. pp. 210-211.
- 5 NLRK. 189-190. *yad-vṛttaṃ hi parāriham syāt pradhānasyopakāraḥ | pradhāna-vacca kalpeta patākā sābhidhiyate* // NŚ. GOS. XIX. 24.
- 6 NLRK. II. 193-194.
- 7 NLRK. II. 195-198. According to Mg. (NLRK. I.465) *mitra-sampāt* is Patākā, but this *mitra-sampāt* belongs to whom has not been stated.
- 8 Bhā-pra. p. 201. II. 14, 16 ; RŚ. p. 211.
- 9 Abhi-bhā. NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 15 ; Avaloka. DR. p. 4. Cf. also DR. II. 8, and Avaloka p. 40.
- 10 SD. below VI. 67, *yathā-rāmacarite sugrīvādeḥ, veṇyām bhīmādeḥ, śākuntale vidūṣakasya caritam* | Bhīma may be called the hero of the drama according to modern taste. Śāradaṭanaya actually calls him so as has already been pointed out.
- 11 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 15, *parasya prayojana-sampattaye bhavadapi sva-prayojanaṃ sampādayati* /
- 12 Bha-pra. p. 201. I. 15 ; ND. p. 39 ; RS. p. 210 ; NC. p. 9.
- 13 DR. I. 13. *prāsaṅgikaṃ parārthasya svārtho yasya prasaṅgataḥ* /
- 14 SD. VI. 67. pp. 352-353.
- 15 LPSD. pp. 74-75.
- 16 NŚ. GOS. XIX. 29.
- 17 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 18 *ā garbhād-āvimarśād-veti pratimukhe garbhe yadi vā | yam arthaṃ vyāpya nivartate patāketivṛttaṃ tāvatyeva patākā-nāyakasya svaphala-siddhir upa-nibandhanīyā, siddha-phalastvasau pradhāna-phala eva vyāpriyamāṇa āsino'pi bhūta-pūrva-gatyā patākā-śabda-vācya na mukhyatvena |vinipāta-pratikāra-pradhāna*—(Text reads...*pratikāraḥ pradhāna-vimarśa* etc., which seems to

be corrupt) *vimarśa-sandhau prastutopayogaḥ patākāyāḥ* | It is evident that Abhinava attaches much importance to the Svārtha-lābha of the Patākā-nāyaka.

The correctness of the portion *pratimukhe garbhe yadi va* of the text is questionable. Abhinava further says that *ān* in *āgarbhād* etc., of the above is to be taken in the sense of *abhivīdhi* and criticises the view that takes it in the sense of *maryādā* as untenable. Cf. (p. 18) *abhivīdāvān | ye tu maryādāyām tāṃ vyācakṣate te na samyagamāṃsata |* But in that case the *phala-lābha* of the Patākā-nāyaka cannot be restricted in the second and third Sandhis only. The view of the ND. as given below, seems to be more reasonable.

- 18 SD. p. 353, *yattu muninoktam-āgarbhād-vā vimarśād-vā patākā vinivartate | iti tatra patāketi patākā-nāyaka-phalaṃ, nirvahaṇa-paryantam aṇi patākāyāḥ pravṛtti-darśanāt, iti vyākhyātam abhinavagupta-pādaiḥ |*
- 19 ND. p. 39, *yadā maryādāyām-ān tadā āmukha-pratimukha-garbhān, yadā punarabhivīdihau tadā vimarśam abhivyāpya vīramatī | tāvatyeva patākā-nāyakasya svaphala-siddhir-nibādhyate | nirvahaṇa-sandhāvapi tat-phale nibadhyamāne tulya-kālayor upakāryopa-kāratvābhāvāt na tena pradhānasyo-pakārah syāt |*
- 20 NLRK. II. 194-195.
- 21 M. Dillon translates the above statement of Sgn. as,—“And it is completed in the *garbha* juncture or in the *avamarśa* juncture. This is not to be carried through to the very end. Cf, NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 11. But syntactically the pronoun *sā* in Sāgara’s statement undoubtedly refers to Patākā, and *etat* through *iti* refers to *saca*..... *nivartata*. The sentence thus means,—(The statement) that Patākā comes to an end in the Garbha or Vimarśa, should not be taken as *ātyantika*, universal rule to be observed.

Prakarī (Incident)

- 1 NLRK. II. 201-205. NS. GOS. XIX. 25, Bhā-pra. p. 201. II. 19-20.
- 2 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 15. *prakarṣeṇa svārthānapekṣayā karotīti* |
- 3 ND. p. 41. *patākāvad-anavaśyambhāvitvam* |
- 4 SD. VI. 69 ; RS. p. 210. III. 14 ; NC. p. 9.
- 5 NLRK. I. 199.
- 6 Bhā-pra. p. 202. II. 4-5. *sobhāyai vaidikādīnām yathā puṣpā-kṣatādayaḥ|tathātra varṇanādīstu prabandhe prakarer-bhavet||*
The RS. (p. 211) quotes the above from the Bhā-pra. but reads the second half as : *tathā tu varṇanādīstu prasaṅgau prakarī bhavet* |
RB. also quotes from the Bhā-pra. the same passage with a different reading of the second half of the verse yielding a new meaning. Abhi-śaku. p. 168,—*athartu-varṇanādīstu prasaṅge prakarī bhavet*. On the authority of this reading RB. calls the description of the spring season in the Act. VI. of the Abhi-śaku as Prakarī. The contention that the description of a season in a relevant place is Prakarī is quite a new idea. But how a simple description can be taken to be an Arthaprakṛti is not known to us.
- 7 NLRK. II. 205-207 ; SD. p. 353 ; Bhā-pra. p. 202. I. 1.
- 8 ND. p. 41.
- 9 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 15.

Kārya (Denouement, Object, Purpose to be achieved)

- 1 NLRK. II. 209-210. *yadarthe kāvya ārambhaḥ (kāvyārambhaḥ ?) siddhe yasmin samāpanam | ānusaṅgika-sampannam tat kāryam iti kathyate ||*

The SD. (VI. 69-70, p. 353) gives a very similar description of Kārya, *āpekṣitām yat sādhyam ārambho yanni-*

bandhanaḥ | samāpanam tu yat siddhyai tat kāryam iti sammatam | It may be pointed out here that according to this definition, the Kārya cannot be called a *prayojana-siddhi-hetu*, as maintained by Viśvanātha himself (Cf. SD. p. 353). In that case the purpose and the means become the same thing.

- 2 NLRK. II. 211-215. *yadāha bharataḥ :*

*yadādhikārikam kāryam pūrvameva prakīrtitam |
tadartho yaḥ samārambha-stat kāryam iti kīrtitam||*

NŚ. GOS. XIX. 26, the reading here differs from that of the NLRK., mainly in the first half of the verse. The GOS. text reads *vastu* instead of *kāryam* of the NLRK. But the reading of the NLRK. is supported by one ms.(ya).

RB. quotes the verse in his Arthadyotanikā (Abhiśaku. p. 230) and attributes it to Mātrgupta. RB's reading tallies with that of the GOS. text.

- 3 NŚ. GOS. XIX. 2. quoted in the NLRK. II. 218-219.

- 4 NLRK. II. 257-261.

- 5 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. pp. 15-16...*cetanaiḥ kāryate phalam iti vyutpatyā (kāryam) | ...tena janapada-kośa-durgādika-vyāpāra-vaicitryam sāmādyupāya-varga ityetaḥ sarvaṁ kārye antarbhavati | tatra param prathama-parigṛhitam pradhāna-bhūto'bhyupāya bijatvenoktaḥ |*

- 6 ND. p. 42.

- 7 JOI. Vol. V. No. 4. p. 373. Cf. Abhi-bhā. NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 55. *bija-kāryopagamanam-ādānam-iti bija-phalasya samipatā-bhavanam ; p. 57.....atra ratnāvalī-lābha-rūpa-kāryasyopakṣepād grathanam |*

- 8 DR. I. 16 and Avaloka on it.

- 9 RS. p. 213 ; NC. p. 9.

- 10 Bhā-pra. p. 203. l. 20 ; p. 204. l. 3, p. 205. l. 3.

- 11 JOI. Vol. V. No. 4. p. 372.

- 12 JOI. Vol. V. No. 4. p. 372. Cf. the definition "*kāryam nirvāhakṛt phale*" PRYB. p. 107,

- 13 NLRK. I. 234.

14. NLRK. II. 235-236. NS. GOS. XIX. 27. *eṣāṃ tu yasya yenārtho yataśca guṇa iṣyate | tat pradhānam tu kartavyam guṇabhūtānyataḥ param ||*
15. NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 16...*na sarvatra prārambhādivat sarva arthapra-kṛtayo'pi | api tu yasya nāyakasya yenārtha-prakṛti-viśeṣeṇa prayojana-sampattir-adhikā tadeva pradhānam, anyattu bhavadapi guṇa-bhūtam asatkalpam,.....bija-bindu-kāryāpi tu sarvatrānapāyini | tatrāpica guṇa-pradhāna-bhāvaḥ |*
16. ND. pp. 27-28, 42-43.
17. RS. III. 20-21, *aṅgam syāt nāyaketara-ceṣṭitam | nityam patākā prakarī cāṅgam bijādayaḥ kvacit ||* Cf. NC. p. 10.

Chapter IV

1. NLRK. II. 456-457. *samdhīḥ parasparam kathārthānām samghaṭanam |*
2. NLRK. II. 457-458. *yathoktam samdhīyante arthāḥ parasparam ebhir-iti samdhayaḥ |*
3. NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 23. *tenārthāvayavāḥ sandhīyamānāḥ parasparam aṅgaiśca sandhaya iti samākhyā niruktā|tadeṣāṃ sāmānya—lakṣaṇam |*
4. ND. I. 37. p. 48. *mukhyasya svatantrasya mahā-vākyārthasya amsā bhāgāḥ parasparam svarūpeṇa cāṅgaiḥ sandhīyanta iti sandhayaḥ |*
5. DR. p. 6 ; I. 23. *antaraikārtha-sambandhaḥ sandhīr-ekānvaye sati | Avaloka,—ekena prayojanenānvitānām kathāṃśānām avāntaraika-prayojana-sambandhaḥ sandhīḥ |*
6. Bhā-pra. p. 207. II. 11-15 ; SD. p. 355, VI. 75.
7. Abhi-śaku. Ed. Godbole p. 15 ; Mu-rā. Ed. Telang. 1893, pp. 52, 62.
8. DR. III. 26.
9. Śr. pra. Vol. II. p. 484, *athaitad upādheḥ kathā-śarira-bhāgānām mukhādayaḥ pañca vyapadeśā bhavanti |*
10. RS. III. 28. p. 215. NC. (p. 11) simply quotes this definition of the RS.
11. Mu-rā. Ed. Deshpande Act. VI, p. 179.

- 12 NLRK. I. 458 ; NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 23, XIX. 37 ;
ND. p. 48 ; Bhā-pra. p. 207.1.17.
- 13 NLRK. II. 440-446 ; NS. GOS. XIX. 17.
- 14 NLRK. II. 447-451 ; NS. GOS. XIX. 18.
- 15 Cf. Abhi-bhā. NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 11 .. *tatropakramo-
pasamhārau tāvat sarvatrāvaśyambhāvinau* |
- 16 NLRK. II. 451-453. *prāsaṅgikasyādhikārikasyārthe varta-
mānasya yadi vistarāt samdhayo vidhātum pañcāpi śakyante
tadayam niyamo nāvaśya-kartavyatayā abhyupagantavyaḥ* |
- 17 NLRK. II. 454-455 ; NS. GOS. XIX. 19.
- 18 NLRK. II. 456. *vṛttam yat tadavirodhataḥ samdhinām
prayoktavyam* |
- 19 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 11. *niyamo ya ukto niyamāt pūrṇa-
sandhi syād ityādi sa tatra na bhavet* |... *yad-vṛttam iti
tatrādhikārike yad aviruddham...tadeva prāsaṅgike yojanār-
ham iti* |. The verse (NS. GOS. XIX. 19) *prāsaṅgike
parārthatvāt* etc. has been taken to refer v. no. 17, *pūrṇa-
sandhi ca kartavyam* etc., by Abhinava.
- 20 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 10. *upādhyāyāstvāhuḥ* :— *sarvatre-
tivrṛttam pañca-sandhyeva, na hi kaścidapi vyāpāro prāram-
bhādyavasthā-pañcakam vinā siddhet*... | *avasthāpañca-
kānuṣṭhāyini sandhipañcakenāpi bhāvyameva, tena sarvaṃ
niyamāt pañcasandhi, hīnasandhitvaṃ tu kāraṇād-apūrṇān-
gatva-lakṣaṇādūcyate*... |
- 21 Abhi-bhā. NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 11.
- 22 NS. GOS. XIX. pp. 44-47.
- 23 DSL. p. 119.
- 24 JOI. Vol. V. No. 4. p. 378.
- 25 JOI. Vol. V. No. 4. p. 378. Cf. Dr K. C. Pandey, Com-
parative Aesthetics. Vol. I. p. 431.
- 26 The Skt. Dr. p. 299.
- 27 The Skt. Dr. p. 298.

View of Mātrgupta on Sandhis

- 1 NLRK. Eng. Tra. Introduction. p. 7.
- 2 NLRK. preface VIII, IX.

- 3 Sañ-dā. p. 97. For the date of Śubhañkara Cf. introduction.
- 4 NLRK. ll. 460-61. Sañ-dā (p. 97) reads :— *prārthanā viṣayaut...[...mukha-sandhāvītīritam ||* The text of the NLRK. reads,— *prārthanāviṣayotsukyam* etc. Cf. Dr Raghavan's correction, NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 72. Dr Raghavan suggests "*prārthanā* is *viṣayautsukyam*," is the meaning.
- 5 NLRK. ll. 474, 480, 481.
- 6 NLRK. ll. 472-481. *tatra yathā māyā-madālase nāṭake prathame aṅke gālavya maharṣeḥ tālaketu-vadham icchataḥ prārthanāyām kuvalayāśvasya rājñāḥ tapovana gamanautsukyam ārambhaḥ | tasyaiva saṃvāde ete kṣama* etc. a speech of the sage Gālava in verse). After that Sāgara adds :— *atra rāja-dharmasyākhyānād-yāgasya niṣpanna-ṣaṣṭāṃśaśca* (Dr Raghavan suggest the reading as : *yāgasya niṣpattiḥ ṣaṣṭāṃśaśca* or *yāgaśca niṣpannaḥ* Cf. NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 72) *me bhaviteti gamana-hetucintanam | bijam tatraiva | devārāter* etc., (a verse).
Many of the *daṇḍas* have been remove from the above text according to Dr Raghavan's suggestion. He, however, proposes to remove the *daṇḍa* after *ārambha* and to place one before it, but nothing is said regarding the underlining of the word. Cf. NLRK. Eng. Tra. Dr Raghavan's corrections and emendations, p. 72. Cf. also Bhār-Ko., p. 316 where *Ārambha* has been taken to be the name of the aspect.
- 7 According to Dr Raghavan's suggestion,—Eagerness (*Prārthanā*) i.e., the yearning for the object, the *Ārambha* i.e., the reflection upon the means etc. Cf. NLRK. Eng. Tra. ll. 460-461.
- 8 NLRK. ll. 472-488. The name of the Nāṭaka *Māyāmadālasā*, based on a Puranic story is first heard of from the NLRK. The drama has not been referred to in any of the reputed works like *Abhi-bhā.*, *DR.*, *ND.*, *Bhā-pra.*, *SD.* and *RS.* All the illustrations of *Sandhis* and their phases, as described by Mātrgupta have been

illustrated by Sīgara with citations from this drama. There are two more citations from the drama in the NLRK. (l. 276 and l. 324). The entire portion of *atra rājadharmasya .bhaviteti* (quoted above) followed by *iti*, does not appear to be the speech of the king as suggested by Dr Raghavan (Cf. NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 72). The reference to *rājadharma* in Gālava's speech is the cause of king's thought and not a part of the speech. It appears that the thought of the king has been referred to here without giving the exact speech. At best the portion *yāgaśca...bhavita* may be taken to be the speech of the king.

- 9 NLRK. ll. 462-463. The printed text reads *citta* in place of *binduḥ*; the Sañ-dā. (p. 97) however, reads *binduḥ*. In illustration (l. 501) Sāgara also reads *binduḥ*. Other variants in the Sañ-dā. are *prasṛtikriyā* in place of *prasṛtā-kriyā*, and *matam* instead of *trayam*.
- 10 NLRK. ll. 489-490. *lābho madālasāyās-tasyā dvītiye aṅke yat pāṇigrahaṇam sa eva sādhana-sampattiḥ* ll. 497-498. *prasaraḥ kriyāyā vaira-prabhavāyāḥ prasārāt* | ll. 501-502. *punarapi haraṇasyodghāto binduḥ* | *sa eva sādhana-sambandhaḥ* | The text reads *haraṇasyotkhyāto*, corrected by Dr Raghavan (NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 62) as above.
- 11 NLRK. ll. 489-494.
- 12 NLRK. ll. 495-498.
- 13 NLRK. ll. 498-506.
- 14 Cf. supra. Bindu.
- 15 NLRK. ll. 464-465. Śubhaṅkara (Sañ-dā. p. 97) reads *bhadra* in place of *tatra* in the first foot and the second as :—*udbheda sandhi—darśanam*, the ms. reading being *sannidarśanam*, both yielding no sense.
- 16 NLRK. ll. 539-512. A verse *kaṇṭhe varoru* etc., here the hero expresses his desire for amorous play. l. 513. *iti rājñah suratecchā sambhogah* | *tatra ca yogyatā* | ll. 515-516. *aniṣṭasya viyogasya udghāta udbhedaḥ* (Text reads *utkhyāta*, Dr Raghavan suggests *udghāta*. Cf. NLRK.

Eng. Tra. p. 62) / *tat pratighātaḥ siddhi-darśanam* / II. 517-519... *arciṣi patitām madālasām na dahatā dahanena maitrī darśiteti mitrasampanmitralābhaḥ* / *iti triyuto garbhaḥ* /

17 NLRK. I. 514.

18 NLRK. II. 515-516.

19 NLRK. I. 466-467. Śubhaṅkara (Saṅ-dā. p. 97) reads the verse as :

nāśaḥ kāraṇa-mādhuryam kiñcit śreyasi vighnatā /
etānyavamarśa-sandhau kathitāni manīṣibhiḥ //

20 NLRK. II. 519-523. The text in the portion *savighnatayā tālaketu* .. seems to be corrupt. *Tālaketu* has been described as killed in the Act. II. The ms. reads (NLRK. p. 22) *pātālaketu*. The Nāgarī *ya* is very similar to *pa*, correct reading should be *pātālaketu*. A *daṇḍa* after *savighnatā* also is necessary to make the sense clear. The text, as translated by M. Dillon, seems to yield no clear meaning. The discussion above, is according to the emendation proposed here.

21 NLRK. II. 468-469. Śubhaṅkara gives almost a separate description of this Sandhi. Saṅ-dā. (p. 97) reads :

punar-bījasya sampattir-nānābhūtārtha-sambhavā /
nirvahaṇa-sandhau kathitā suribhir-bharatādibhiḥ //

It is apparent that Śubhaṅkara collected this description from a corrupt source. The first *pāda* of this verse is the third *pāda* of the verse describing Vimarśa-sandhi in the NLRK. (I. 467). Moreover Bharata nowhere describes the Nirvahaṇa sandhi in the manner stated in the above verse of Saṅ-dā.

22 NLRK. II. 523-529.

23 NLRK. Eng. Tra. Introduction. p. 7 (quoted above). Dr S. N. Shastri (LPSD. pp. 96-97) maintains that "Mātr-gupta follows the co-ambulation theory of juncture". It is a wrong judgement, as is evident from the above.

24 Saṅ-dā. p. I. *saṅgūtacūḍāmaṇi-ratnaśoṣa* etc.

25 See supra. Introduction, age of Sāgaranandin.

- 26 NLRK. I. 472. *māyāmadālasā-nāṭake*. II. 276-277. *māyāmadālasē-pañcasvapyāṇkeṣu kuvalāyaśvaḥ* |
- 27 NLRK. I. 493.
- 28 NLRK. I. 324.
- 29 NLRK. II. 470-471.
sādhakaḥ sādhanam sādhyam siddhiḥ sambhoga eva ca |
ityāhuḥ ke' pi nāṭyajñāḥ santaḥ sādhyādi-pañcakam ||
- 30 NLRK. II. 530-533.
 It is from the NLRK. first that we come to know the name of a drama *Bhīma-vijaya* of an unknown author, like the *Māyāmadālasā*, *Bhīma-vijaya*, perhaps was written in a region where Sāgara lived. Dr Raghavan maintains (NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 70) that *Bhīma-vijaya* may refer only to a theme and not to an actual play.
- 31 LPSD. p. 96.
- 32 Sāgara himself seems to have confused the issue. He in his gloss, first explains the verses describing Sandhis according to Mātrgupta and then illustrates the pentad of Sādhyā etc., and at last remarks : *idam mātṛguptena samkṣepāt* (NLRK. I. 534) etc. It appears from this that Mātrgupta according to Sāgara is the propounder of the *Sādhyādipañcaka* theory. But the verse quoted above, which enumerates the pentad, clearly shows that this is an older view of some other theorists. Perhaps Sāgara took the verse from the text of Mātrgupta, but overlooks the expression *kecit* and ascribes the view to Mātrgupta. The view has not been mentioned anywhere else.
- 33 NLRK. I. 535.
- 34 Abhi-śaku. p. 9. The full description is quoted, Supra, Chap. 1. under Qualitative Analysis.
- 35 P. V. Kane (HSP) p. 55 ; Dr S. K. De (HSP) p. 34 ; Dr V. Raghavan (NLRK. Eng. Tra.) p. 7.

Mukha-Sandhi

- 2 NLRK. I. 536-537, *yatra bija-samutpattir-nānā-bhūtārtha-sambhavā | kāvya-śarīrānugata tanmukhaṃ parikīrtitam ||*
NS. GOS. XIX. 39. Here the first half of the verse is read as : *yatra bijā samutpattir-nānārtharasasambhavā |*
The difference of readings in the underlined portions of the two is significant.
- 3 NLRK. II. 538-540.
- 3a Cf. supra f.n. 2. NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 23. *nānābhūto 'rthavaśāt prasaṅgāyāto rasa-sambhavo yaḥ syāt.*
- 4 ND. p. 48.
- 5 SD. VI. 76-77. The reading here tallies with that of the NS. (GOS). Bhā-pra. p. 207. I. 18, p. 208. I. 7.
- 6 DR. p. 7 (I.24) Dhanañjaya simply takes up the first half of the verse from the NS. describing Mukha-sandhi as the definition of the same. The NC. (p. 11) also does the same. RS. III. 29-30. p. 215. Here Dhanika's statement has simply been versified.
- 7 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 24, ND. p. 48, Bhā-pra. p. 207. I. 19, SD. p. 356.
- 8 Cf. Supra. under Mukha-sandhi according to Mātrgupta.
- 9 Bha-pra. p. 207. II. 20-21. *bijotpattirna hetuḥ syād rāsānām mukha-sandhibhāk | teṣāṃ trivarga-saṃ-bandhaḥ prāyo yasmān na dīśyate |*
- 10 Bhā-pra. p. 207. I. 21, p. 208. II. 1-6.
- 11 NLRK. II. 545-546. *sāhacaryeṇa bijasya mukha eva hi kecana | binduna ādau prakurvanti nāṭakārthavido janāḥ ||*
- 12 NLRK. II. 547-548.
- 13 Cf. supra. Bindu.
- 14 NLRK. II. 548-550.
- 15 Cf. supraunder Bija.

Pratimukha-sandhi

- 1 NLRK. II. 634-635. NS. GOS. XIX. 40.
- 2 NLRK. II. 636-631. Tārānātha Tarkavācaspati, in his commentary on the V-saṃ quotes the following verse

and attributes it to Bharata. (V-sam. Ed. Jivananda. p. 19).

*ānuṣaṅgika-kāryeṇa kriyate yat prakāśanam |
naṣṭasyeveha bijasya sandhiḥ pratimukhaṁ bhavet ||*

The verse may be construed as : *ānuṣaṅgikakāryeṇa naṣṭasya iva bijasya iha prakāśanam* etc., and can be taken as supporting the view of Sāgara. The source of the above verse is unknown but it is evident that the view held by Sāgara was known in Bengal as that of Bharata through some lost source in Bengal even before a century.

3 Cf. V-sam. Ed. Jivananda. Act I. p. 19.

4 NLRK. II. 639-642. Cf. V-sam. Ed. Jivananda. p. 56. Here in the NLRK. the reading of the quotation from the V-sam. differs from that of the printed text of the drama.

5 NLRK. II. 145-147.

6 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 24. It may be pointed out here that the first view above states exactly the opposite of what has been said by Sāgara (NLRK 1.636. *dṛṣṭam kāraṇarūpeṇa kāryarūpeṇa naṣṭam*). But the approach of the both to the problem is similar. The criticism of Abhinava however, can be applied with equal force against the above observation of Sāgara. Abhinava criticises the above views as :—*na caitat samañjasam|ekaviṣyam antareṇa sandhānājogāt,nāṣasyāpica dṛṣṭatayaiva samgraha-sampatteḥ |*

7 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 24. *bijasyodghāṭanam tāvāt phalānuguno daśāviśeṣaḥ taddṛṣṭam api virodhisamnidher-naṣṭamiya, pāṁṣunā pihitasyeva bijasyāṅkura-rūpam udghāṭanam |*

8 Cf. V-Sam. Ed. Jivananda. p. 34. Act II. V. No. 2.

9 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 24. *atra pāṇḍavābhyudayasya mukhopakṣiptasyodghāṭanam bhīṣmavadhā dṛṣṭam abhi-manyuvadhān-naṣṭam atrāpiveditam iti kecit| tadā cārtho na saṁgamitaḥ syāt |* The reading corrected by Prof. S. Bhattacharyya (JOI. Vol. V. No. 3. p. 321) has

- been accepted. The text puts a *daṇḍa* after 'naṣṭam' and then reads 'atrāpi' etc.
- 10 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 24.
- 11 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 24.
- 12 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 25. *udghāṭitavād bijasya stoka-mātram tu śaṅkukādibhi-rudāhṛtam yat tad eka.....iti draṣṭavyam |*
- 13 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. pp. 24-25. *drṣṭam naṣṭamiva kṛtvā tāvanmukhe nyastam bhūmāviva bijamtadācchādakamapi bhūmiriva pratyudbodhakam|tasya drṣṭanaṣṭatulyam kṛtvā nyastasya ata eva kuṅkuma-bijasya yad udghāṭanam tat-kalpaṃ yatrodghāṭanam sarvatraiva kathābhāgasamūhe tat pratimukham pratirābhi.....|*
- 14 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. pp. 24-25.
- 15 ND. p. 49.
- 16 DR. p. 11. SD. VI. 77-78. RS. p. 220. NC. p. 15. Bha-pra. p. 208. ll. 21-22.
- 17 Bha-pra. p. 209. ll. 1-3.

Garbha-sandhi

- 1 NLRK. I. 709.
- 2 NLRK. II. 710-711. *udbhedastasya bijasya prāptir-aprāptir-eva ca | punścān-veṣaṇam yatra sa garbha iti saṃsmṛtaḥ ||* NŚ. (GOS. XIX. 41) reads *vā* instead of *ca* as the last word of the first half of the verse.
- Rāghava-bhaṭṭa (Abhi-śaku. p. 115) attributes this definition to Ādhi-bharata. Śr. pra. (Vol. II. Chap. XII. p. 485) reads *kāryabijasya* instead of *tasya bijasya* in the first half, and the second half as : *anviṣyate tu yastatra sa vai garbha itiritaḥ |*
- 3 NLRK. I. 712.
- 4 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 25 ; ND. p. 49.
- 5 SD. VI. 78-79. p. 357. Abhinava also refers to a view which seems to give this explanation, Cf. NŚ. GOS. Vol.

- III. p. 25. *phalasya garbhībhāvāt* | Cf. also ND. p. 49.
phalaprapṭi-sambhāvanā-rūpo garbha-sandhirucyate |
- 6 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 25. *prāptir-nāyaka-viśaya, aprāptiḥ*
pratināyaka-carite punaścānveṣaṇam ityubhaya-sādhāraṇam |
- 7 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 25. *anye tu vira-raudra-viśaya*
evaitasyārthasya bhāvād avyāpitvād evaṃ āhuḥ | *prāptiḥ,*
aprāptir-anveṣaṇam-ityevaṃ bhūtābhir-avasthābhiḥ punaḥ
punar-bhavantībhir-yukto garbha-sandhiḥ, prāpti-sambhāvā-
khyayāvasthayā yuktatvena phalasya garbhībhāvāt |
- 8 ND. p. 49.
- 9 NS. GOS. Vol. III. pp. 25-26. The Avaloka and SD.
 also cite the same illustration. Cf. DR. p. 16 ; SD. p.
 357. The SD. almost quotes the Abhi-bhā and uses
udbheda and *hrāsa* instead of *prāpti* and *aprāpti*.
- 10 DR. p. 16. I. 36 ; Bhā-pra. p. 209. I. 22 ; p. 210 ; II. 1-4 ;
 SD. p. 357. VI. 78-79 ; RS. p. 225. III. 49 ; NC. p. 20 ;
 Śr. pra. Vol. II. p. 485. *yatra kriyāphalasyodbheda-lābha-*
nāśānveṣaṇādayo jāyante tatra garbhaḥ |
- 11 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 26. *avamarśe tvaprapṭereva pradhā-*
natā prāptyamśasya ca nyūnateti viśeṣaḥ | The text is
 undoubtedly corrupt and has been rightly amended by
 the editor as : *avamarśe tu prapṭereva pradhānatā aprāp-*
tyamśasya ca nyūnatā | The ND. supports this reading.
 Cf. ND. p. 49.
- 12 NLRK. II. 716-719. *nāṭakādau vastudvayaṃ bhavati* |
vidhirvā niṣedho vā | *tatra prāptirūpo vidhiḥ* | *aprāpti-rūpo*
niṣedhaḥ | *prāptirūpo yathā bijam-ārabdham rākṣasām*
kṣayaḥ | *nītam sītāpahāreṇa rāmasyāvaśya-kāryatāmīti* ||
 The word *nītam* is to be replaced by *nītaḥ*. The verse
 seems to be taken from some old source, probably from
 the text of Mg. For note on such verses, see *infra*,
 chapter V, under Aṅgas of the Mukha-sandhi, f.n. 40.
- 13 NLRK. II. 713-715.
- 14 NLRK. II. 720-723. The drama *Tāpasa-vatsarāja* of
 Anaṅgahaṛṣa Mātrarāja, son of king Narendravardhana
 has been cited once more in the NLRK. (I. 792) and

that also without mentioning the name of the drama or its author. References to and citations from this drama occur in the printed text of the Abhi-bhā as many as ten times and eight times in the ND. Ānanda-vardhana, Kuntaka, Hemachandra, Bhoja and Mammaṭa also knew the drama. The drama, according to Dr S. K. De, "belongs to a period earlier than the middle of the 9th century". Being edited by His Holiness Sri Yaḍugiri yatiraja Sampath Kumara and Ramanuja Muni from the Berlin manuscript of the play, it was published in 1928 from Bangalore.

- 15 Cf. supra Garbha-sandhi according to Mātrgupta.

Vimarśa or Avamarśa

- 1 NLRK. II. 772-774. *yadāha bharata-muniḥ | garbha-nirbhinna-bijārtho vilobhana-kṛto 'pivā | tasya vāśleṣa-samyuktaḥ sa vimarśaḥ iti smṛtaḥ ||* The NS. (GOS. XIX. 42) reads *athavā* in the place of *apivā* at the end of the first half, and *krodha-vyasanajo vāpi* as the first part of the second half. A ms. however reads *kiñcid-āśleṣa-samyukta*, and thus supports the reading of the NLRK. mainly [Cf. NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 26. ms. reading 4 (bha)]. But none of the expositions given by Abhinavagupta including his own, mentions *āśleṣa*. He seems to support the reading *apivā* at the end of the first half of the verse. Cf. NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 27. *api-sabdād vighnanimittāntarāṇām* etc. The text of Śaṅkuka, as presented in the Abhi-bhā. (Vol. III. p. 28) seems to support the GOS. reading so far as the first part of the second half of the verse is concerned. Śr. pra. (Vol. II. chap. XII. p. 485) gives the definition as, ...*garbha-nirbhinna-bijārthaḥ krodhavyasanajo 'pi vā | vipralambhakṛto vāpi vimarśa iti sañjitaḥ ||* A ms. of the NS. (Pa) reads *vipralambhakṛto pi vā* in place of *vilobhana* etc. of the GOS. version.
- 2 NLRK. II. 770-772. *nanu vimarśa iti ko'rthaḥ | ucyate*

*garbheṇa sandhinā udbhinnasya bijārthasya lobhakāriṇā
āśleṣaṇasamyukto (yo) bhavati sa vimarśaḥ |*

- 3 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 27. *anye tvavamarśo vighna iti vidanti/
sa ca (?) vyākhyāne bija-śabdena tad-bija-phalam artha-
śabdena nivṛttirucyate |.....nivṛttiḥ...niḥpratyūhaprāṇatayā
phalaprasūtiḥ |*
- 4 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 27.
- 5 SD. VI. 79-80.
- 6 SD. p. 358.
- 7 NS. GOS. Vol. III. pp. 27-28.
- 8 NLRK. II. 775-777. *anyastvāha | prakīrṇasyārtha-jātasya
vimarśād yatra samvṛtiḥ | śatorapacayo bhūyān vimarśa
sa ca kathyate ||* Dr Raghavan suggests that *śator upa-
cayaḥ* should be the reading in place of *śatorapacayaḥ*
of the printed text. NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 72. But it has
been shown (Cf. supra under Garbha-Sandhi) that
according to Abhinavagupta the *Vimarśa-sandhi* gives
prominence to the gain over the loss of the hero. How
this principle can be maintained if the increasing strength
of the enemy (*śator upacayaḥ*) is depicted in this Sandhi,
is not known. Moreover, according to Mātrgupta also,
nourishment of the Bija (*bijena sampatti*) is an aspect of
this Sandhi. This has been illustrated by Sāgara in the
death of Pātālaketu (Cf. supra. View of Mātrgupta on
Sandhis) which is undoubtedly a heavy loss to the enemy
of the hero. So loss of the enemy seems to be a charac-
teristic of this Sandhi and as such, the reading of the text
seems to be preferable.
- 9 Cf. supra under Patākā.
- 10 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 28... *phalavyāpatti-viśayo yaḥ
kartur-vicāraḥ sa krodha-vyasanaje vimarśa ityevaṃ vimar-
śana-svabhāva eva vimarśaḥ |..... iti śrī-śaṅkukaḥ |*
- 11 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 28.
- 12 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 28.
- 13 DR. I. 43. p. 21. Dhanika says : *avamarśanam avamarśaḥ
paryālocanam | tacca krodhena vā vyasanād vā vilobhanena*

- vā bhavitavyam* | Bhoja (Śr pra. Vol. II. p. 485) says :—
kriyāphalāvāptaye vicāranirṇayo vimarśaḥ | It, however,
 includes *vipralambha* as a cause of deliberation. Cf. supra
 fn. 1 of this topic.
- 14 Bhā-pra. p. 211. ll. 10-11 and ll. 12-13.
- 15 RS. p. 229. III. 57-58 ; NC. p. 23.
- 16 NLRK. ll. 778-780. *anyastvāha* |
saṃpannarūpaṃ yat kāryaṃ prastāveneha kiṃcana |
manasyāyāti sandehaṃ (sandehaḥ ?) vimarśam ke'pi
taṃ viduḥ ||
- 17 NLRK. ll. 783-790.
- 18 NLRK. ll. 791-792. This perhaps, refers to the fifth Act
 of the *Tāpasa-vatsarāja* where Kuñjaraka describes how
 Rumaṇvān and Yaugandharāyaṇa etc. inflict a defeat
 upon the enemy.
- 19 NLRK. ll. 793-797.
- 20 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 26. *tatra sandehātmako vimarśaḥ* |
- 21 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. pp. 26-27.
- 22 Cf. Abhi-bhā. NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 27.....*phalaṃ yadā*
valavatā pratyūhyate kāraṇāni ca valavanti bhavanti.....
tadā kathaṃ na sandehaḥ |
- 23 ND. p. 50.

Nirvahaṇa-sandhi

- 1 NLRK. ll. 854-855. NŚ. GOS. XIX. 43. Here the first
 half of the verse (following the commentary of Ag.) is
 read as :
saṃāyananam arthānām mukhādyānām sabījinām | But
 Ag. in his commentary on this refers to a view that reads,
mahaujasām phalopasaṅgutānām ca. One ms. also (Pa)
 reads the last word of the first half as, *mahaujasām*. Cf.
 Abhi-bhā. Vol. III. p. 29. Śr. pra (Vol II. XII. p. 485)
 reads the verse as, *yatrāyananam arthānām mukhādyā-*
nām mahaujasām / phalopabṛmhitānām etc. ||
- 2 NLRK. ll. 856-857.

- 3 Cf. supra under Arthaprakṛti.
- 4 Cf. supra. under Nirvahaṇa-sandhi according to Mātṛgupta.
- 5 NŚ. GOS. III. p. 29. *mukhādyānām caturṇām sandhinām ye' arthāḥ prārambhādyāḥ teṣām sahaḥajibhiḥ bijavikāraiḥ krameṇāvasthācatuṣṭayena bhavadbhiḥ.....vartamānānām nānāvidhaiḥbhāvaiḥ uttarāṇām camatkārāspadatve jātota-karṣāṇām yat samānayanam yasminnartharāṣtau samāniyante phala-niṣpattau yojyante tan-nirvahaṇam phalayogā vasthayā vyāptam |*
- 6 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 29.
- 7 ND. p. 51.
- 8 DR. I. 48-49. *bijavanto mukhādyarthā viprakīrṇā yathāyatham|aikārtham-upanīyante yatra nirvahaṇam hi tat ||* It is interesting to note that Sarvānanda in his *Ṭikāsarvasva* attributes this verse to Dattila. *Nāma-liṅgānuśāsanam* with the com. of Sarvānanda. Ed. T. Ganapati Sastri. Pt. I. p. 144.
- 9 Bhā-pra. p. 212. ll. 89 ; SD. VI. 80-81, p. 359 ; RS. p. 233. III. 67 ; NC. p. 29.
- 10 Śr. pra. Vol. II. p. 485.
- 11 NLRK. ll. 920-922.
- 12 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 29.
- 13 ND. pp. 51-52.
- 14 NLRK. ll. 918-919. *vipadantara-nirmāṇam kecīdicchanti sūrayaḥ | jānakya jvalana-jvālā-praveśena vipat punaḥ ||*
- 15 Notes of Dr Raghavan. NLRK, Eng. Tra. p. 63.
- 16 NLRK. ll. 918-919.
- 17 NLRK. l. 389. *devatā-darśanāntam ca bhavati hi nāṣakam nāma.*
- 18 NLRK. ll. 390-392.....*devarṣayo 'pi kvacit|te'pi devatulyā eva |*
- 19 An-rā. p. 320. *devatā-darśanāntam ca kartavyam nāṣakam budhaiḥ | rājarṣi-darśanāntam vā te'pi devaiḥ samā matāḥ || iti bharatānurodhād vaśiṣṭha-darśanāntam idam |*
- 20 Sañ-dā. p. 81.

- 21 Cf. supra. f.n. 17.
- 22 NLRK. II. 915-917. NS. GOS. XVIII. 43. Cf. Śr pra. XI. p. 466 ; Bhā-pra. p. 236. 1. 4 ; SD. VI. 10. p. 321 ; cf. also the Sandhyaṅga Upagūhana infra.
- 23 NLRK. II. 913-914. NS. XVIII. 42. Cf. SD. VI. 11. p. 322 ; ND. I. 17. Śr. pra (XI. p. 466) reads, *kāvyam gopucchāgram kartavyam nāṭikādiṣu prājñaiḥ| nāṭikādiṣu* here seems to be a wrong reading for *nāṭakādiṣu*. According to lexicons one meaning of the word *gopuccha* is a kind of necklace having forty or thirtytwo strings. Cf. the com. of Kṣīrasvāmin on *Amarakoṣa*, Kāṇḍa II. V. No. 106 (Poona Oriental Series No. 43. p. 156). *Abhidhāna-cintāmani*, Kāṇḍa III. V. No. 325.
- 24 NLRK. II. 910-911.
- 25 Cf. W. H. Hudson. An Introduction to the study of Literature, pp. 200ff.
- 26 NS. GOS. Vol. II. p. 428. *krama-sūkṣmāṅgam iti kecit|* The reading of the SD. (below VI. 11. p. 323) *kramenāṅkāḥ sūkṣmāḥ kartavyāḥ iti kecit* is decidedly more explicit.
- 27 NS. GOS. Vol. II. pp. 428-29 ; cf. ND. p. 30 ; SD. p. 323.

Relation among the three Pentads ; the Avasthās,
Sandhis and Arthaprakṛtis

- 1 NS. GOS. XIX. 14. *sarvasyaiva hi kāryasya prārabdhasya phalārthibhiḥ|etāstvanukramenaiva pañcāvasthā bhavanti hi ||*
- 2 Techniques of Sanskrit Drama, Chap. IV. (In press).
- 3 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 10. *avasthā-pañcakānuyāyinā sandhi-pañcakenāpi bhāvya eva |* Cf. also p. 23, p. 62, *sandhayo hyavasthā-paratantrāḥ |*
- 4 ND. I. 37. p. 48.
- 5 ND. p. 44.
- 6 SD. VI. 74. p. 355.
- 7 The TSS. p. 13.
- 8 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 10. Cf. supra under Sandhis, f.n. 20.

- 9 The TSS. p. 14. Here Dr Mainkar further states that the DR. is responsible to correlate the Avasthās with the Sandhis. But, it has been shown above that the responsibility may be pushed back to at least the preceptor of Abhinava.
- 10 NS. GOS. XIX. 21.
- 11 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 12. ...*jñātvā yojyā yathā-vidhi iti tāsām auddesikoktivad upanibandha-krama-niyama ityarthah* / This is Ag.'s gloss on the NS. (XIX. 21) *arthaprakṛtayah* etc., as quoted above. This statement of the NS. seems to imply that the five Arthaprakṛtis are to be used in a proper manner. From this it is hard to deduce that they are to be used in a particular order. The Bija originates in the Mukha-sandhi and the Kārya occurs in the last Sandhi, but no restriction can reasonably be imposed upon other three, as has been made clear in our discussions on their nature above. Abhinava further maintains (NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 16) that all the Arthaprakṛtis are not essential everywhere. Moreover, the mechanical theory of correlation among the Avasthās, Arthaprakṛtis and the Sandhis, resting primarily on the occurrence of their members in the same order in which they have been enumerated in the NS., has been bitterly criticised by Abhinava, as will be shown. The ND. (p. 37) following closely the Abhi-bhā. in other relevant matters; opposes the view that the Arthaprakṛtis occur in a drama in a particular order. Thus, the above reading of the Abhi-bhā. seems to be unjustified. Perhaps a 'na' has been dropped. All problems become solved if the above text is amended as,—*kramaniyamo netyarthah*.
- 12 ND. p. 37. *bijaṃ patākā prakarī binduḥ kāryaṃ yathāruci* / (I. 28) *yathārucīti naiṣām auddeśiko nibandhakramah sarveṣām ayaśyāmbhāvītvam vā* /
- 13 Dr Mainkar. The TSS. p. 13 ; Dr Kulkarni. JOI. Vol. V. No. 4. The conception of Sandhis in Sanskrit Drama. p. 375.

- 14 DR. p. 6. I. 22-23. *arthaprakṛtayaḥ pañca pañcāvasthā-samanvitaḥ || yathā-saṃkhyena jāyante mukhādyaḥ pañca sandhayaḥ* | Cf. also Avaloka on this verse.
- 15 DR. I. 25. Regarding the aṅgas of the Mukha-sandhi it is said : *aṅgāni dvādaśaitasya bijārambha-samanvayāt* |, similarly about Pratimukha-sandhi is said (I. 30) *bindu-prayatnānugamād aṅgānyasya trayodaśa* | The DR. does not maintain that the aṅgas of other three Sandhis should be determined in the similar way.
- 16 Bhā-pra. p. 207. II. 3-10. Regarding the aṅgas of the Mukha and Pratimukha, Śāradātanaya quotes from the DR. Cf. Bhā-pra. p. 208. I. 7 ; p. 209. I. 6 and DR., quoted in f.n. 15 ; RS. III. 22.26. pp. 214-215 ; NC (p. 11.15) follows the RS. verbatim. Śr. pra. Vol. II. p. 484. *te (Sandhis) ca bija-bindvādīnām arthaprakṛtīnām sandhānāt sandhāya (sandhaya?) ucyante* | It is a novel explanation of the word Sandhi, though based on an unsound theory.
- 17 Cf. Supra f.n. 11.
- 18 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 16. Abhinava following his preceptor, accept a coambulation between the Avasthās and Sandhis, as discussed above.
- 19 ND. p. 37.
- 20 DR. I. 36.. *patākā syānnavā syāt prāptisambhavaḥ* | Cf. Dhanika (p. 16) *tatra cautsargikatvena prāptāyāḥ patākāya aniyamam darśayati...* |
- 21 Bhā-pra. p. 210. II. 10-12. *abhavāstu patākāyā yathā mālavikādiṣu || sadbhāvo dṛśyate tasya mālatīmādhavādiṣu | tasmāt patākā syān-neti vikalpaṃ prāha kohalaḥ ||* Cf. also I. 5.
- 22 Bhā-pra. p. 210, II. 6-8. *tathāpyasyā niveśaḥ syāt prāptyā-śāyā niyogataḥ || apatāke niveśaḥ syād bindor bijasya vā kvacit ||*
- 23 RS. III. 27. p. 215. Śīṅgabhūpāla supports the use of the Bindu only in the Garbha-sandhi in absence of a Patākā there, *patākāyā vihīne tu bindum vā viniveśayet* |

24. RS. III. 49 (p. 225) *āprāptiśā-patākānurodhād aṅgāni kalpayet* / III. 58 (p. 229) *prakarī-niyatāptyānugūṇyād atrāṅgakalpanam* /
25. RS. III. 27. p. 215. *patākāyāstvavasthānam kvacidasti na vā kvacit* /
26. NC. p. 29. *atrāṅgakalpanā kārya-phalāgama-samāgamāt* /
27. Cf. supra. Arthaprakṛti.
28. RB. Abhi-śaku. (Ed. Godbole) p. 115, p. 168.
29. RB. Abhi-śaku (Ed. Godbole) p. 168.
30. Mā. ag. p. 60.
31. Mā. ag. p. 98.

Anusandhi

1. NŚ. GOS. XIX. 28.
2. NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 17. *tathā lollaṭādyāstu manyante parārthe sādhayitavye patākā-nāyakasyetiṣṭtabhāgā anusandhayaḥ* /
3. NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 17. *patākāyām hi pūrṇa-varṇane patākāntaram syād ityanavasthā* /
4. NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 17.
5. ND. pp. 43-44.
6. DR. III/27. *patākā-vṛttam apyūnam ekādyair anusandhibhiḥ aṅgānyatra yathālābham asandhiṃ prakariṃ nyaset* || Cf. also Avaloka, p. 70.

Chapter V

1. NLRK. II. 556-557 ; NŚ. GOS. XIX. 69.
2. NLRK. II. 559-562.
3. NLRK. I. 558. *yathā veṇṣaṃhāre prathamāṅke* /
4. NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 37 ; ND. p. 37.
5. NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 37.
6. SD. below VI. 82, p. 360. The NŚ (GOS. V. 168) while

describing the Prastāvanā enjoins : *nānā-vidhair upakṣe-paiḥ kāvyopakṣepaṇaṃ bhavet* ; this in practice is generally done through indirect hints to the central theme of the play. In the Abhi-śaku, the forgetfulness of the Sūtra-dhāra serves this purpose. So, the first Sandhyaṅga may be included in the prelude.

- 7 V-sam. Ed. Jivananda pp. 9-10.
- 8 NLRK. II. 568-569 ; NS. GOS. XIX. 70.
- 9 NLRK. II. 571-574.
- 10 NLRK. II. 575-581 ; Abhi-bhā. NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 31 ; ND. p. 54.
- 11 DR. p. 9.
- 12 NLRK. II. 583-585.... *athavā|saṃśuddhārtha-bhāṣaṇaṃ yat tat parinyāsaḥ | saṃśuddhaṃ tattvabhūtaṃ yad bhāṣaṇaṃ sa eva parinyāsaḥ | nānānurodhād iti |*
- 13 DR. I. 27 ; ND. pp. 53-54 ; Bhā-pra. p. 208. II. 12-13 ; RS. pp. 216-217 ; NC. pp. 11-12.
- 14 NLRK. II. 586-587 ; NS. GOS. XIX. 71.
- 15 NLRK. II. 589-592. Cf. V-sam. Act. I. p. 26.
- 16 ND. p. 56 ; NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 38. Cf. also SD. p. 362. Cf. V-sam. Act. I. p. 25.
- 17 RS. III. 34. p. 217.
- 18 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 38.
- 19 ND. p. 56.
- 20 NLRK. II. 593-594 ; NS. GOS. XIX. 71 ; DR. I. 28 ; ND. I. 45 ; SD. VI. 84.
- 21 NLRK. II. 596-597.
- 22 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 39. *asyāḥ prayojanaṃ prakāśya-prakāśanaṃ |*
- 23 NLRK. II. 598-599. *mukhārthasyopagamana (m?) prāptirityabhidhīyate |* One ms. of the NS. (GOS. Vol. III. p. 39, 6 bha) reads : *mukhyarthasyopa...* / The ms. of the NLRK reads...*khysy...* (Cf. NLRK. p. 26, f.n. 1). Thus *mukhyasyārthasyopagamana* might have been the reading of Sāgara's source.
- 24 NLRK. II. 601-604. Cf. V-sam. Act. I. p. 19.

- 25 NS. GOS. XIX. 72. *sukhārthasyābhigamanam prāptirityabhisamjñitā* / Abhinava supports this reading. Cf. Abhi-bhā. NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 39. Dr M. Ghosh prefers the reading *mukhārtha*. Cf. NS. Eng. Tra. p. 390.
- 26 DR. I, 28. p. 8 ; ND. I. 45. p. 57 ; SD. VI. 84.
- 27 NLRK. II. 605-606 ; NS. GOS. XIX. 72.
- 28 NLRK. I. 608. This verse of Bhīma has been taken to be an example of Bheda by Abhinava. Dhanika and Rāmacandra-Guṇacandra. Cf. NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 42 ; DR. p. 11 ; ND. p. 57.
- 29 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 40.
- 30 NLRK. II. 609-610. *sukha-duḥkha-yukto yo artha-stad-vidhānam yadāha sukha-duḥkhānvito yo arthaḥ* | etc. The NS. (GOS. XIX. 73) reads : *sukhaduḥkha-krto yo'rthaḥ...* | The SD (VI. 85) supports this reading.
- 31 NLRK. II. 612-616. There are two other verses in the NLRK (II. 751-753, 755-757) said to be taken from the *Bālacarita* and one (II. 540-542) from the *Bālacarita Rāmāyaṇa*, which are neither from any known drama nor from the *Rāmāyaṇa* itself. These verses may be surmised to be taken from some text of dramaturgy like the work of Mātr̥gupta or some lost play. See f.n. 40 infra. *Bālacarita*, in contrast to the *Uttaracarita* may be taken to refer simply to the first part of Rāma-story ending with the coronation of Rāma. Cf. the title *Bālārāmāyaṇa* of Rājaśekhara. There are two verses in the U.ca. (Belvalkar's edition. Act. VI. VS. 31-32) which said to be taken from the *Bālacarita* and actually occur in the *Bālakāṇḍa* of the *Rāmāyaṇa* (Lahore, N.W. recension, chap. 72. VS. 13-14). This also shows that the first part of the Rāma-story was traditionally called *Bālacarita*.
- 32 SD. p. 364.
- 33 DR. p. 9.
- 34 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 41 ; ND. p. 55.
- 35 NLRK. I. 617 ; NS. GOS. XIX. 73. reads : *kutūhalotta-*

rāvego .../ The KM. edition of the NS. (XIX. 72) reads :
kutūhalottarāveṣo .../

36 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 40.

37 NLRK. I. 619. *ṇādha kiṃ eso khaṇe khaṇe* etc.

38 NS. GOS. Vol. III. pp. 40-41 ; DR. p. 10 ; SD. p. 364.

39 NLRK. I. 620 ; NS. GOS. XIX. 74.

40 NLRK. II. 621-622. Dr Raghavan in his notes on this verse remarks (NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 62), "In the quotations made in the NLRK. there are some printed in small type, which occur frequently in the text ; they seem to be taken from some text on dramaturgy in Anuṣṭubhas, like the work of Mātr̥gupta, in which the principles and illustrations from the themes of well-known plays are given together in the text. For such verses embodying both *lakṣya* and *lakṣaṇa*, see below (II.) 707-708, 767-768, 792, 1210-1211, 1239-1240, 1242-1243, 1294-1296 ; pp. 84-89, the Anuṣṭubhas under Vyābhicārinś and Sāttvikas with illustrations of themes from *Rāmāyaṇa* and *Mahābhārata*". The suggestion that the verses containing both *lakṣya* and *lakṣaṇa* are taken from the work of Mātr̥gupta seems to be very much tenable due to the fact that three such Anuṣṭubhas (II. 103-108), printed in bold type and referring to the Rāma-story, have been attributed to Mātr̥gupta by Sāgara himself (I. 102). Three other Anuṣṭubhas (II. 225-226, 718-719, 918-919) printed in bold type, refer to the Rāma-story and may be said to contain principles and illustrations. Another verse (1276-1277) in the same metre printed in small type, may also be included in the group of Anuṣṭubhas containing both *lakṣya* and *lakṣaṇa*.

41 NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 72.

42 NLRK. I. 624 ; NS. GOS. XIX. 74.

43 NLRK. II. 623-624.

44 ND. p. 56.

45 NS. GOS. XIX. 75. *saṅghāta-bhedanārtho yaḥ sa bhedaḥ* ;

46 NLRK. I. 626. *saṅghātena militasyārthasya bhaṅgo bhedaḥ* ;

- 47 NLRK. II. 628-631.
- 48 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 41.
- 49 ND. pp. 56-57. (I. 44). *bhedanam pātranirgamaḥ*.
- 50 DR. I. 29. Cf. Avaloka. p. 11. This view of the DR. has been referred to as the opinion of some in the ND. (p. 57) and in the SD. (p. 365).
- 51 SD. VI. 87. p. 365.
- 52 ND. p. 57.
- 53 DR. p. 11. The ND. (p. 52) also maintains the same view. It further opines that Vilobhana etc., may be used, if required in other Sandhis also ; the Bheda on the other hand should be used (*avaśayaṃ nibandhāniyaḥ*) at the close of each Act, Praveśaka and Viśkambhaka.

Aṅgas of the Pratimukha-sandhi

- 1 NLRK. II. 650-651. *samīhā rati-sambhogārthā vilāsaḥ | sambhogo vā suratotpanno vilāsaḥ...* | NŚ. GOS. XIX. 76. There is a ms. reading : *sambhogo rati-sampanno* | Cf. NŚ. (KM.) XIX. 74 and GOS. Vol. III. p. 42. ms. bha.
- 2 NLRK. II. 651-656.
- 3 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 42.
- 4 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 42.
- 5 ND. p. 62.
- 6 NLRK. I. 657; NŚ. GOS. XIX. 76; DR. I. 32; SD. VI. 90.
- 6a NLRK. II. 659-662.
- 7 ND. p. 72. While enumerating the *aṅgas* the ND. (I. 47) read Upasarpa.
- 8 Bhā-pra. p. 209. l. 11. *bījasya dṛṣṭa-naṣṭānusarpaṇam* |
- 9 NLRK. I. 663. *ādāvanunayasya kṛtasyāparigraho* | NŚ. GOS. XIX. 77 ; SD. VI. 90. ND. (p. 62) names the *aṅga* as Dhūnana and defines it as : *sāmnayanādara* and takes *anādara* to mean *manāganādṛti*.
- 10 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 43... *paścāt punaraṅgākaraṇam iti* |
- 11 NLRK. II. 663-668.

- 12 DR. p. 12. I. 33. SD (p. 367) refers to this definition as the opinion of some. A ms. of the NŚ. also gives this definition of the *aṅga* Vidhūta. Cf. NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 43, f.n. 2.
- 13 ND. p. 62.
- 14 NLRK. I. 669 ; NŚ. GOS. XIX. 77 ; ND. (p. 67) reads Tāpa.
- 15 NLRK. II. 669-671.
- 16 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 44.
- 17 SD. VI. 91. *upāyādarśanam yattu* etc. p. 638.
- 18 DR. I. 33. p. 13. The ND. (p. 68) refers to this view. One ms. of the NŚ. reads Śama instead of Tāpana and defines it as the dispelling of that (*arati*) created in Vidhūta. Cf. NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 43, f.n. 2 and 3.
- 19 NLRK. II. 1312-1313.
- 20 NŚ. GOS. XIX. 78 ; ND. I. 49.
- 21 DR. I. 33. p. 13.
- 22 SD. VI. 91. p. 368.
- 23 NLRK. I. 672. *krīḍā-vilobhanārthaṃ hāsyam* |
- 24 NLRK. II. 674-675.
- 25 NŚ. GOS. XIX. 78. *doṣapracchādanārthaṃ tu hāsyam narmadyutiḥ...* | ND. I. 49. p. 67.
- 26 ND. p. 67. *ete ca narma-narmadyutī aṅge kāma-pradhāneṣveva rūpakeṣu nibandha-marhataḥ, kaiśiki-prādhānyena teṣāṃ hāsyocitatvād iti* |
- 27 DR. I. 33. p. 13 ; SD. VI. 91. p. 369.
- 28 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 45.
- 29 Hall's edition reads Pragayaṇa. The Śr. pra. reads Praśamana (Śr. pra. XII. p. 512).
- 30 NLRK. I. 676. *uttarottaraṃ pragamaṇam* | NŚ. GOS. XIX. 79. *uttarottaravākyam...* | SD. VI. 92. The definition, *pragamaḥ prati-vāk-śreṇiḥ* found in the ND. (I. 50. p. 69) also means the same thing.
- 31 NLRK. II. 676-682. The drama has been cited but once in the NLRK. Neither any citation from this drama nor its name is found to occur in renowned works like

- the Abhi-bhā., DR., Bhā-pra., ND., RS., SD. etc. Dr Raghavan maintains that the Nāṭaka *Rāma-yikrama* deals with the earlier *Rāmāyaṇa* story. Cf. SOLRP. pp. 96-97.
- 32 DR. I. 34. p. 14...*anyonya-vacanenottarottarāmūrāgabi-jodghātanāt...*
- 33 Bhā-pra. p. 209. l. 15.
- 34 NLRK. I. 683 ; NS. GOS. XIX. 79 ; SD. VI. 92. p. 369.
- 35 NLRK. II. 684-686.
- 36 DR. I. 34 ; ND. p. 62.
- 37 NS. GOS. XIX. 80 ; NLRK. II. 687-690. The illustrations of the three *aṅgas*, Virodha, Paryupāsana and Puṣpa have been cited with quotations in the NLRK. from different phases of the Paraśurāma episode of the Rāma-story. The first and the last are said to be taken from the drama *Jānakī-Rāghava* (Cf. NLRK. I. 684 and I. 692). The verse : *alam bhārgava* etc., (II. 689-690). quoted as an illustration of the Paryupāsana seems to be taken from the same drama.
- 38 DR. I. 34. p. 14 ; ND. I. 48. p. 63 ; SD. VI. 92-93. p. 370.
- 39 NLRK. I. 691 ; NS. GOS. XIX. 80 ; Cf. DR. I. 34. p. 14 ; SD. VI. 93. p. 370 ; ND. I. 49. p. 68.
- 40 NLRK. II. 691-692. *anyatra kriyāyāmitara-kriyādhikyam viśeṣa-vacanam* |
- 41 NLRK. II. 692-696.
- 42 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 46... *prema-vikāsi puṣpam...* |
- 43 ND. p. 68.
- 44 NLRK. 697. The NS (GOS. XIX. 81) defines Vajra as a harsh speech uttered to one's face, *pratyakṣa-rukṣaṃ yad vākyam*, but the reading *rukṣaprayāṃ* of the NLRK. is supported by one ms. Cf. NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 46. ms. bha ; Śr. pra (XII. p. 513) and the SD. (VI. 63) follow the reading of Abhinava as adopted in the GOS. version. The DR. (I. 35) and the ND. (I. 50) also follow this reading and keep the word *pratyakṣa*, replacing only *rukṣa* by *niṣṭhura* and *karkaṣa* respectively.

- 45 NLRK. II. 697-699. Another reference of the Act called Pumsavana, occur in the NLRK. (II. 2820-2821) and the Bhā-pra. (p. 250. II. 20-21) also contains the same in the same context, i.e., as an illustration of the third variety of Kapaṭa. Dr Raghavan informs us (NLRK. Eng. Tra. pp. 62, 63. SOLRP. p. 55) that it is the opening Act of the lost Rāma-play *Chalita-rāma*. The name of the author is unknown to us. In the NLRK. (II. 974-976, 1824-1825) there are two more references to another Act, named Anutāpa of this drama. Sāgara does not mention the name of the drama itself which, however, has been referred to once in the Abhi-bhā. (NŚ. GOS. Vol. I. p. 39). Citations from the *Chalita-rāma* are found in the Avaloka (DR. pp. 22, 66, 68), ND. (pp. 86, 92, 132, 133, 137), SD. (p. 445). The verse : *āsādita-prakaṣa-nirmala-candra-hāsaḥ* etc., anonymously quoted by Dhanika (DR. pp. 63, 65). Viśvanātha (SD. p. 332) and Bhoja (Śr. pra. vol. II. p. 497), is from the Prastāvanā of this drama, as informs the ND. (p. 137). From the citations in above mentioned works it appears that like the Uttara-rāma-carita and the Kundamālā, the *Chalita-rāma* also takes up the Uttara-kāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa as its subject matter and there are striking deviations from the story of Vālmiki. Keith seems to be in favour of placing this drama in 1000 A.D. (Sanskrit Drama. p. 223), while Dr K. K. Datta Sastri (Ku. mā. pt. I. p. 181) places it in the 9th century A.D. The said scholar also remarks, "The Uttara-rāma-carita and the *Chalita-rāma* seem to have some influence of the Kundamālā on them" (Ku. mā. pt. I. p. 184). Cf. also SOLRP. pp. 50-59.
- 46 NLRK. I. 700 ; NŚ. GOS. XIX. 81. *upapattikṛto yo'rthaḥ*/ RB. in his Arthadyotanikā (Abhi. śaku. p. 108) ascribes this definition to Ādi-bharata.
- 47 NLRK. II. 700-703.
- 48 ND. p. 71. The RS. (p. 224) follows this definition.
- 49 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 46. f.n. 2. (*bha*) *sopāya-vacanam yattu sa upanyāsa ucyate*/ DR. I. 35. p. 15.

- 50 DR. p. 15, f.n. 2. *prasādanam upanyāsaḥ* | SD. VI. 93. p. 370 ; Bhā-pra. p. 209. l. 17.
- 51 Śr. pra. Vol. II. p. 504. *pratimukha-sandhāvapi dvāda-śāṅgāni* |
- 52 Abhi. śaku. p. 107. Upanyāsa as *prasādana* ; p. 108, Upanyāsa as *upapattikṛto yo'rthaḥ*.
- 53 NLRK. I. 704. *varṇitasyārthasya tiraskāro varṇa-saṃhāraḥ* | The Śr. pra. (vol. II. p. 513) also describes the *aṅga* as : *varṇitārthatiraskāro varṇasaṃhāra ucyate* |
- 54 NLRK. II. 704-705.
- 55 NLRK. I. 706. *caturṇām varṇānām sammilanam api ke'pi varṇayanti* |
- 56 NŚ. GOS. XIX. 82. *cāturvarṇyopagamanam varṇa-saṃhāra iṣyate* | Cf. the ms. readidg (pa) *varṇitārthatiraskāro... ucyate* | This definition is found in the Śr. pra., as quoted above.
- 57 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 47.
- 58 ND. p. 65.
- 59 DR. I. 35. p. 15 ; Bhā-pra. p. 209. l. 18 ; SD. VI. 94. p. 391. The SD., however records the view of Abhinava.
- 60 DR. p. 16 ; ND. I. 46-47, pp. 60-61. Pragamana and Upasarpaṇa (p. 72, Anusarpaṇa) of the ND. are Prasāma and Parisarpa respectively of Dhanika.

Aṅgas of the Garbha-sandhi

- 1 NŚ. GOS. XIX. 82 ; NLRK. I. 727 ; DR. I. 38. p. 16 ; ND. I. 55. p. 80 ; SD. VI. 95. p. 372.
- 2 NLRK. II. 728-729. The SD. (p. 372) cites the same illustration, so also does the Śr. pra. (vol. II. p. 514).
- 3 NŚ. GOS. XIX. 83 ; NLRK. I. 730 ; DR. I. 38. p. 16 ; ND. I. 55. p. 79 ; SD. VI. 95 ; Śr. pra. vol. II. p. 514.
- 4 NLRK. II. 730-734.
- 5 NLRK. I. 735. *citrārtha-samāyukto vitarko rūpam* | NŚ. GOS. XIX. 83. *citrārtha-samāvāye tu vitarko rūpam- iṣyate* |

- 6 NLRK. II. 736, 737.
- 7 Śr. pra. Vol. II. 515 ; SD. p. 373.
- 8 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 48 ; ND. p. 75.
- 9 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 48. *vicitrārthānām samavāye sam-
bhāvane sarva-viśaya eva viruddhastarkaḥ* | .. yuktistu
niyata-pratipatti-paryanteti viśeṣaḥ .. | Thus according to
Abhinava's interpretation Rūpa does not differ from the
Sandehālamkāra.
- 10 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 48 ; DR. p. 14.
- 11 DR. I. 39.
- 12 ND. pp. 73-74.
- 13 NŚ GOS. XIX. 84. *yat sātīśayavad-vākyam...* |
- 14 NLRK. I. 738. *sātīśayaṃ vacanam udahāraṇam* | This is
supported by two ms. readings of the NŚ. (GOS. Vol.
III. p. 48).
- 15 NLRK. I. 739.
- 16 Śr. pra. Vol. II. p. 515 ; SD. p. 373.
- 17 NŚ. GOS. XIX. 84. *bhāvatattvopalabdhistu krama ityabhi-
dhīyate* | Abhi-bhā. (Vol. III. p. 49) says, *bhāvasya
bhāvyamānasya vastunaḥ.....ya paramārthopalabdhiḥ* |
- 18 NLRK. I. 740.
- 19 NLRK. II. 741-743. The Śr. pra. (Vol. II. p. 516) cites
this illustration but defines Krama as : *bhāvatattvopa-
labdhiḥ* (p. 515).
- 20 ND. p. 76.
- 21 DR. I. 39. p. 17 ; ND. p. 76 ; Bhā-pra. p. 211. l. 3.
- 22 DR. I. 39. p. 18.
- 23 ND. I. 54. p. 76.
- 24 SD. VI. 97. p. 374.
- 25 NŚ. GOS. XIX. 85 ; NLRK. I. 744 ; DR. I. 40. p. 18.
- 26 NLRK. I. 745.
- 27 NŚ. GOS. XIX. 85 ; NLRK. I. 746 ; DR. I. 40. p. 18 ;
ND. I. 53. p. 74 ; SD. VI. 98. p. 375.
- 28 NLRK. II. 747-748. The SD. as an illustration of
Anumāna (below VI. 98. p. 375) quotes the whole verse
and informs : *yathā jānaki-rāghava-nāṭake rāmaḥ* | The

first half of the verse as quoted there is, *lilāgatairapi taraṅgayato dharitrim ālokanairnamayato jagatām śirāṃsi* | Here Sugrīva is described.

- 29 DR. I. 36. p. 16 ; Bhā-pra. p. 210. l. 16 ; RS. III. 51. p. 225 ; Viśvanātha also (SD. p. 376. VI. 99) records the view.
- 30 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 50. *bha-māṭṛkāyaṃ prārthanā-lakṣaṇaṃ nopalabhyate* |
- 31 ND. p. 75.
- 32 NS. GOS. XIX. 86.
- 33 NLRK. II. 749-750. There are three more citations (NLRK. II. 758-760, 761-765, 1666-1670) from the Act called after Sampāti, the brother of Jaṭāyus. This is an Act from a lost Rāma-play, not referred to in any other work. From a study of the above four citations (SOLRP. pp. 102-103) Dr Raghavan shows the power of the poet in innovating ideas, such as an attempt of the Rākṣasas to dupe the monkeys ; and a female character, a Rākṣasi named Māyāvati, trying her wits on Aṅgada, Hanumat and others.
- 34 Abhinava reads Ākṣipti, three ms. readings are recorded in the NS. (GOS. Vol. III. p. 50) viz., Ākṣepa, Ākṣipta and Upakṣipta. DR. (I. 42) reads Ākṣepa and this reading is found in the ND. (I. 54), Bhā-pra. (p. 211. l. 8), RS (III. 51). The SD. (VI. 99) reads Kṣipti.
- 35 NS. GOS. XIX. 86. Abhinava comments : *hrdayāntaḥ sthitaṃ (tasya)...kutaścinnimittād udbhedanam...* |
- 36 ND. I. 54. p. 78. *ākṣepo bijaparakāśanam* | It takes *bijasya* to mean *mukhakāryopāyasya* and also *hrdaya-bhūmi-nigūḍhatvād abhiprāyasya*, as an alternative.
- 37 SD. VI. 99. *rahasyārthasya tadbhedaḥ kṣiptiḥ syāt* |
- 38 NLRK. I. 751.
- 39 NLRK. II. 751-753.
- 40 NLRK. I. 754.
- 41 DR. I. 42. p. 20.
- 42 ND. p. 78.

- 43 NLRK. I. 755 ; NŚ. GOS. XIX. 87.
- 44 NLRK. II. 755-757.
- 45 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 51. *āvegā-garbham yad-vacanam tattoṭakam|sa cāvego harṣāt, krodhāt, anyato 'pivā|bhinatti yato hṛdayam tatastoṭakam |*
- 46 ND. p. 81.
- 47 NŚ. GOS. 87. *kapaṭenātisandhānam bruvate 'dhivalam budāḥ|*
Cf. also Abhi-bhā. (Vol. III. p. 51).
- 48 DR. I. 40. p. 18 ; ND. I. 55. pp. 78-79 ; Bhā-pra. p. 211. 1. 5 ; SD. VI. 99. pp. 376-377.
- 49 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 51. f.n. 2. ms. 'pa'.
- 50 NLRK. I. 758. *kapaṭasya anyathākaraṇam adhibalam |*
Śr. pra. Vol. II. p. 517. *kapaṭasyānyathābhāvam... |*
- 51 NLRK. II. 758-760.
- 52 ND. p. 79.
- 53 DR. I. 40. p. 19.
- 54 ND. p. 79.
- 55 NŚ. GOS. XIX. 88.
- 56 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 51. *ariśabdannāci (yi ?) kādi |*
- 57 DR. I. 42. Avaloka p. 20.
- 58 ND. p. 77.
- 59 NLRK. I. 761.
- 60 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 51. f.n. 3. ms. *ta*. SD. VI. 100. *nṛpādijanitabhītiḥ* etc. Śr. pra. Vol. II. p. 518. *bhayam nṛpādijanitam* etc....
- 61 NLRK. II. 761-765.
- 62 NLRK. I. 766 ; NŚ. GOS. XIX. 88.
- 63 NLRK. II. 767-768.
- 64 SD. VI. 100.
- 65 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 52. *anye tu śaṅkā-bhaya-trāsaiḥ kṛto yaḥ sa vidrava iti|tatra ca viśeṣya padam anveṣyam, samudāya eva viśeṣya iti śrī-śaṅkukāḥ |*
- 66 NLRK. I. 769.
- 67 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 52.
- 68 Śr. pra. Vol. II. p. 518 ; ND. p. 77. The ND. names the *aṅga* Drava.

- 69 DR. I. 42. p. 20 ; Bhā-pra. p. 211. l. 7.
 70 SD. p. 376.
 71 DR. p. 21 ; ND. I. 51-52.

Aṅgas of the Vimarśa-sandhi

- 1 NŚ. GOS. XIX. 89 ; NLRK. I. 801 ; DR. I. 45 ; SD. VI. 102.
- 2 ND. p. 83.
- 3 NLRK. II. 801-806. There is one more citation in the NLRK (II. 1703-1707) from the *Māyā-lakṣmaṇa* Act of the *Jānakī-rāghava*. In the present case, the NLRK. says: *yathā-Jānakī-rāghave Māyā-lakṣa-(kṣma?)ṇe rāvaṇaḥ* and the last line of the verse runs: *kariṣyante ghoram vyasanam adhunā rākṣasapateḥ* | It is evident that the verse cannot be put in the mouth of Rāvaṇa (as is done in the NLRK.) who is referred to in the last line in the third person. *rāvaṇam prati*, or *rāvaṇasya*, might have been the correct reading. From these two citations, as noted above, nothing can be guessed as to the nature of the innovation of a *Māyā* or its relation with *Lakṣmaṇa* or the dramatic purpose achieved through it. (Cf. SOLRP. pp. 68-70).
- 4 NŚ. GOS. XIX. 89 ; NLRK. I. 807 ; DR. I. 45 ; ND. I. 58 ; SD. VI. 102.
- 5 NLRK. II. 808-812.
- 6 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 53.
- 7 NLRK. I. 813 ; NŚ. GOS. XIX. 90.
- 8 NLRK. II. 813-814.
- 9 NLRK. II. 815-818.
- 10 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 53. *bharti-saṃnidhāne 'pi vidūṣaka-sya sāgarikā-yāśca vāsavadattayā bandhanam | ...dravaṇam calanaṃ mārgād iti dravaḥ* |
- 11 DR. I. 45 ; Śr. pra. vol. II. p. 520 ; ND. I. 57.
- 12 SD. VI. 103.
- 13 NŚ. GOS. XIX. 90 ; NLRK. I. 819 ; DR. I. 46. p. 23 ; SD. p. 380.

- 14 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 53. Cf. also the illustration, taken from the R.v. (Act. IV) where the king says that the queen has been pacified.
- 15 NLRK. II. 819-823.
- 16 ND. I. 60. p. 88.
- 17 ND. p. 89.
- 18 NLRK. I. 824 ; NŚ. GOS. XIX. 91. *vyavasāyaśca vijñeyah pratijñā-hetu-sambhavaḥ* |
- 19 NLRK. II. 824-825.
- 20 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 54. *pratijñātasyāṅgiktasyārthasya hetavo ye teṣāṃ sambhavaḥ prāptirvyavasāyaḥ* | Cf. ND. I. 60 ; SD. VI. 103 ; Śr. pra. Vol. II. p. 521.
- 21 DR. I. 47. p. 24. *vyavasāyaḥ svaśaktyuktiḥ* |
- 22 Bhā-pra. p. 212. I. I ; RS. III. 65 ; ND. p. 91. The Bhā-pra. (p. 212, I. 2) gives also the definition of *Vyavasāya* as accepted by Sāgara.
- 23 NLRK. I. 824. *aprastutārtha-khyāpanam* |
- 24 NLRK. II. 826-828.
- 25 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 54. ms. *pa. aprastutārtha-vacanam prasāṅgaḥ parikīrtitaḥ* |
- 26 Bhā-pra. p. 211. I. 22 ; ND. p. 82.
- 27 NŚ. GOS. XIX. 91. *gurūṇāṃ parikīrtanam* | DR. I. 46. p. 24 ; ND. I. 58. p. 82 ; SD. VI. 104. pp. 380-381.
- 28 NŚ. GOS. XIX. 92.
- 29 NLRK. I. 829-830.
- 30 NLRK. II. 830-831.
- 31 DR. I. 46. pp. 23-24. *tarjanōdvejane dyutiḥ* ; SD. p. 379.
- 32 ND. p. 85.
- 33 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 55.
- 34 NLRK. I. 832. *manaśceṣṭā-samutpannaḥ śramaḥ khedaḥ* | The GOS. version of the NŚ (XIX-92) reads,—‘*manaś-ceṣṭāvinīṣpanna* etc. ND. I. 59. p. 85 ; SD. VI. 105. p. 381.
- 35 NLRK. II. 832-837.
- 36 ND. I. 59. p. 86. But it reads *Nirodha* (I. 56) in enumerating the *aṅgaś*.

- 37 NS. GOS. XIX. 93 ; NLRK. 838 ; SD. VI. 105. p. 382.
 38 NLRK. II. 838-839.
 39 NS. GOS. XIX. 93 ; NLRK. I. 840.
 40 Śr. pra. Vol. II. p. 523 ; SD. VI. 106. p. 382.
 41 NLRK. II. 840-843. The Śr. pra. (vol. II. p. 524) also refers to the same situation as an illustration of the *aṅga*.
 42 DR. p. 25. In the light of Dhanika's illustration the ms. reading *saṃrambhokti* seems to be better.
 43 Bhā-pra. p. 212. II. 3-4. *saṃrabdhānāmavajñā* and *paraspara-sya saṃgrāmaḥ saṃrambheṇa...*
 44 RS. III. 65.
 45 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 55. f.n. 2. (*bha*) *uttarottaravākyaṃ*, (*da*) *saṃrambhād-uttarottara-bhāṣaṇam*, (*na. ya*) *uttarottara-vākyaṃ* |
 46 NLRK. I. 844. *bīja-kāryopagamaanam* ; NS. GOS. XIX. 94, the reading, *Ātāna* here is undoubtedly an instance of printing mistake. Cf. also Śr. pra. Vol. II. p. 524.
 47 NLRK. II. 844-847. Act IV of the R.V. has been referred to by Palityaṅka in the NLRK. Śr. pra. (vol. II. p. 524) also refers to the same situation as illustration of *Ādāna*.
 48 ND. p. 91.
 49 DR. I. 48. p. 26. *ādānaṃ kāryasaṃgraha*. Cf. Bhā-pra. p. 212. I. 6 ; RS. III. 66. p. 232.
 50 NLRK. I. 848. NS. GOS. XIX. 94.
 51 NLRK. II. 848-849.
 52 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 56. *apamāna-kalaṅkāpavāraṇācchādanamiti* | In this sense the name *chādana* suits well.
 53 ND. p. 84.
 54 DR. I. 46. p. 24 ; *chalanam cāvamānaṇam* ; Bhā-pra. p. 212. I. 1 ; ND. p. 84. *anye tvasya sthāne chalanam avamāna-narūpam āhuḥ* |
 55 RS. III. 64. p. 231.
 56 SD. VI. 107. p. 384. *kāryārtham apamānādeḥ sahanam.....* |
 57 NS. KM. XIX. 93 and f.n. 9.
 58 ND. p. 84.
 59 NLRK. I. 850.

- 60 NLRK. II. 851-852. The whole verse is given in II. 85-88.
 61 NŚ. GOS. XIX. 95. Abhi-bhā. (Vol. III) p. 56.
 62 Śr. pra. Vol. II. p. 524 ; SD. VI. 106. p. 383. In the light of the readings found in the NŚ., Śr. pra. and SD., the reading of the NLRK. may be amended as *saṃhārā-rtha-*
 63 ND. p. 90.
 64 DR. I. 47. *siddhāmantraṇato bhāvidarśikā syāt prarocanā* | Bhā-pra. p. 212. l. 5 ; RS. III. 66. p. 232.
 65 DR. GOS. XIX. 95-96.
 66 DR. I. 45. p. 22, I. 48. p. 26.
 67 Bhā-pra. p. 211. l. 20 ; p. 212. l. 6 ; RS. III. 61. p. 230. III. 66. p. 232 ; NC. p. 24 ; p. 27. It reads Vivalana instead of Vicalana.
 68 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 56.
 69 ND. p. 91.
 70 DR. p. 27.
 71 ND. I. 56-57.

Aṅgas of the Nirvahaṇa-sandhi

- 1 NLRK. I. 861. *pradhānārthopakṣepaḥ arthaḥ* | Perhaps the name Sandhi has been omitted to avoid a confusion with Sandhi, the division of the plot.
- 2 NŚ. GOS. XIX. 97.
- 3 Cf. DR. I. 51. p. 27 ; ND. I. 62. p. 92 ; SD. VI. 110. p. 385.
- 4 NLRK. II. 861-863. There is in the NLRK. only one citation from this lost Rāma-play. Śāradātanaya refers to it twice ; Bhā-pra. p. 217. l. 14, p. 223. l. 2. from the first reference we know that it was a Nāṭaka (*māṛica-vañcite nāṭake kṛtaḥ*) and the second *pañcāṅkameṭan māṛica-vañcitam*) informs us that it was of five Acts. Cf. SOLRP. p. 96.
- 5 NŚ. GOS. XIX. 98. *upakṣepastu kāryāṇām grathanam...* | The NLRK. I. 864. *kāryāṇām bahūnāmupakṣepo grathanam* ;

- Śr. Pra. (Vol. II. p. 525) quotes the NS. verbatim. SD. VI. 110. p. 386. *upanyāsastu kāryāṇāṃ grathanam.....* /
- 6 DR. I. 51. p. 28 ; Bhā-pra. p. 212. l. 19 ; ND. I. 63. pp. 92-93 ; RS. III 70. Illustrations of Grathana cited in these works also show that a reference to the main purpose is intended to.
- 7 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 57 ; SD. p. 383.
- 8 NLRK. II. 864-869.
- 9 NLRK. I. 210.
- 10 Cf. supra, discussion on Kārya.
- 11 NS. GOS. XIX. 99 ; NLRK. I. 870 ; DR. I. 51 ; ND. I. 63 ; SD. p. 386.
- 12 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 57 ; NLRK. II. 870-872.
- 13 NS. GOS. XIX. 99.
- 14 NLRK. I. 873 ; Śr. pra. Vol. II. p. 526 ; ND. I. 63 ; SD. p. 387.
- 15 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 58. *anyonyāparādhodghaṭṭanam vacanam* etc. ND. I. 63. *paribhāṣā svanindanam* /
- 16 NLRK. II. 873-875.
- 17 Śr. pra. Vol. II. pp. 526-527.
- 18 DR. I. 52. p. 28.
- 19 ND. p. 94.
- 20 Bhā-pra. p. 212. ll. 21-22.
- 21 NLRK. I. 876. *īrṣyā-kleśopāśamanam dyutih* /
- 22 Śr. pra. Vol. II. p. 527. *īrṣyā-kopapraśamanam dyutim...* / Cf. NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 58. f.n. 3. ms. pa.
- 23 NLRK. II. 876-878. The name *Kāmadattā-pūrti* is hitherto unheard. The RS. refers to a Prakaraṇa *Kāmadattā* (RS. III. 216. *gaṇikānāyikam dhūrtam kāmadattāhvayādikam*). Dr S. N. Das Gupta (Hist. of Sans. Lit., Cal. Uni., p. 762) informs us that *Kāmadattā*, a work referred to in the Bhāṇa *Padma-prābhrtaka* was probably a Prakaraṇa written by Śūdraka himself. A Bhāṇikā with the title *Kāmadattā* has been referred to in the NLRK. (I. 3161) and in the SD. (p. 458). In both the cases the name has been cited as an example of Bhāṇikā. However,

it is evident that there were a Prakaraṇa (from which Sāgara cites here) and a Bhāṇikā bearing the same title *Kāmadattā*.

- 24 ND. pp. 95-96. *apare tu krodhādeḥ prāptasya śamanam dyutim āmananti* | After the illustration it is remarked, *anena.....ṛsyā-kopasya śamanam* |
- 25 NŚ. GOS. XIX. 100. *labdhasyārthasya śamanam.....* | Abhinava says, *sāmarthyāt praśamanīyasya krodhāderarthasya prāptasyāpi yat praśamanam sa dyutiḥ* |
- 26 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 58. f.n. 5 ms. 'bha'. The reading 'kṛti' seems to be better, as there is another Dyuti in the Vimarśa-sandhi also.
- 27 DR. I. 53.
- 28 DR. Avaloka. p. 30...*ityanena prāptarājyasyābhiṣeka-maṅgalaiḥ sthīrikaraṇam kṛtiḥ* |
- 29 Bhā-pra. p. 213. 1. 2. *kṛtilabdhārthaśamanam tat sthīrikaraṇam tu vā* |
- 30 SD. VI. III. p. 387.
- 31 ND. p. 95. *labdhasya paripālanaṁ kṣemaḥ* |
- 32 ND. p. 95.
- 33 NŚ. GOS. XIX. 101. *śuśrūṣādyupasampannaḥ prasādaḥ prītirucyate* | NLRK. 1. 879. *śuśrūṣādyupapannārthaḥ prasādaḥ* | Śṛ. pra. Vol II. p. 527. *śuśrūṣādyupasampannaḥ prasādaḥ iti kīrttitaḥ* |
- 34 NŚ GOS. Vol. III. p. 59 ; NLRK. II. 879-880.
- 35 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 59.
- 36 ND. I. 64. p. 94.
- 37 DR. I. 52. p. 29 ; Bhā-pra. p. 212. 1. 22 ; SD. p. 287.
- 38 NŚ. GOS. XIX. 100 ; NLRK. 1. 881 ; DR. I. 52. p. 29 ; ND. p. 96 ; Śṛ. pra. Vol. II. p. 527 ; SD. p. 387.
- 39 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 58.
- 40 NLRK. II. 881-882.
- 41 NŚ. GOS. XIX. 101 ; Śṛ. pra. Vol. II. p. 528 ; DR. I. 52 ; ND. I. 64 ; Bhā-pra. p. 213. 1. 1 ; SD. VI. 112. p. 387.
- 42 NLRK. II. 883-885 ; Abhinavagupta (NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 59) also cites the same illustration.

- 43 NLRK. I. 886. *yukta-kāryānveṣaṇam anuyogaḥ* |
- 44 NLRK. II. 886-888.
- 45 NS. GOS. XIX. 98. *kāryasyānveṣaṇam yuktyā nirodha iti kīrtitaḥ* | The reading in the Śr. pra. (Vol. II. p. 525) as : *anyasyānveṣaṇam yuktyā* etc., is evidently corrupt.
- 46 ND. I. 63. p. 92.
- 47 DR. I. 51. p. 27 ; SD. VI. 110. p. 385 ; Bhā-pra. p. 212. I. 18.
- 48 NS. GOS. XIX. 102 ; NLRK. I. 889 ; DR. I. 53 ; ND. I. 64 ; SD. VI. 112. p. 388.
- 49 NLRK. II. 889-890.
- 50 NLRK. I. 891.
- 51 NS. GOS. XIX. 102. *sāma-dānādi-saṃpannam bhāṣaṇam samudāhṛtam* |
- 52 DR. I. 53 ; SD. VI. p. 388 ; ND. I. 65 ; Bhā-pra. p. 213. I. 3.
- 53 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 59 ; NLRK. II. 891-892. The reading *viśvabhūti* in the NLRK. is evidently corrupt and *vasubhūti* is the correct reading.
- 54 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 59.
- 55 ND. p. 99.
- 56 NS. GOS. XIX. 103...*yathokta-kārya-pradarśanam* | Śr. pra. (Vol. II. p. 529) reads : *yathoktākṣepadarśanam* and this reading is supported by the ms. *pa* as recorded by the editor of the NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 60.
- 57 NLRK. I. 893. *bijodghāṭanam* |
- 58 NLRK. II. 893-894.
- 59 Dr Mainkar, The TSS. p. 132.
- 60 DR. I. 53 ; ND. I. 65. p. 99 ; Bhā-pra. p. 213. I. 4. The ND., however, uses the term *Prāgbhāva* instead of *Pūrvavākya*.
- 61 SD. VI. 113. p. 388.
- 62 ND. p. 99.
- 63 NS. GOS. XIX. 103 ; NLRK. I. 895.
- 64 DR. I. 64 ; ND. I. 65 ; Bhā-pra. p. 213. I. 5 ; SD. VI. 114.
- 65 NLRK. II. 895-896.

- 66 NLRK. II. 897-898 ; NS. XIX. 104. Cf. DR. I. 54 ; ND. I. 65 ; SD. VI. 114 ; Bhā-pra. p. 213. l. 6.
- 67 NLRK. II. 899-902. Cf. II. 3145-3146.
- 68 ND. p. 101.
- 69 Cf. N.D. p. 91. *viśeṣānupādānāt sarvānyevaitāni pradhānāni*
- 70 ND. p. 101-102.
- 71 Mṛccha. Ed. V. R. Nerurkar.
- 72 For details on Bharata-vākya see, A Note on Bharata-vākya (IHQ., Vol. V. 1929. pp. 549-52) and A Further Note on Bharata-vākya (IHQ. Vol. VII. pp. 190-91) of Prof. Chintaharan Chakrabartty, and Prologues and Epilogues in Sanskrit Drama (OH. Vol. V. Pt. I) by Dr Kalikumar Datta Shastri.
- 73 Abhi-śaku. p. 263. *bharata-vākyam naṭa-vākyam | nāṭakā-bhinayasamāptau sāmajikebhyo naṭenāśīrdīyata ityarthah |*

Number, name and definitions of the Sandhyaṅgas

- 1 NLRK. I. 903.
- 2 Both Sāgara and Abhinava accept the numbers of the five successive Sandhis as 12, 13, 13, 13, 14 ; thus the total is 65.
- 3 NS. GOS. XIX. 67.
- 4 NS. GOS. XIX. 95-96. Cf. supra, concluding portion of the *aṅgas* of Vimarśa-sandhi.
- 5 Śr. pra. (Vol. II. p. 504) maintains that the number of the Pratimukha-sandhi is twelve.
- 6 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 34.
- 7 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 56.
- 8 ND. p. 91. In this case the total number becomes 63.
- 9 Cf. supra. discussion or Prārthanā (no. 8) of the Garbha-sandhi.
- 10 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 56. The text is corrupt here. It reads : *nirvahaṇasandhāvapi prasakteritvittāntarbhūtatvena gaṇanamanyāyyam iti |* The correct reading seems to be, *praśasteritvittāntarbhūta..... |*

- 11 SD. (p. 376) below VI. 98.
- 12 See DSL of R. V. Jagirdar. pp. 27-31.
- 13 Cf. Prasāṅga and Vidrava, *supra*. It may be noted that the definition of Krama in the NLRK. finds no support from above sources.

Application of the Sandhyaṅgas

- 1 Cf. V-sam. Ed. Jivananda Vidyasagara, Calcutta, 1934. According to Sāgara's citations from the Act. I of the drama, Prāpti (p. 19) occurs before Parinyāsa (p. 25); Vidhāna is used before Samādhāna (p. 31); while Paribhāvanā (p. 29) and Karaṇa (p. 30) are located before Samādhāna and Vidhāna (p. 31). Thus the order of enumeration (NLRK. II. 553-555) is not maintained while locating the *aṅgas*.
- 2 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 36. *lakṣaṇa evāyaṃ kramo na nibandhana iti yāvat | tena yadubhāṭaprabhṛtayo' ṅgānām sandhau krame ca niyamam āhustad yuktyāgamaviruddhameva |*
- 3 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 62. Ag. unequivocally states : *sammiśrāniti sandhyantaroktaṃ sandhyantare'pityarthaḥ |* Cf. ND. p. 102. *amīṣām ca svasandhau sandhyantare ca yogyayā nibandhaḥ |*
- 4 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 37.
- 5 Bhā-pra. p. 208. l. 20 ; p. 209. l. 19 ; p. 211. l. 9 ; RS. III. 76. p. 238.
- 6 DR. p. 8. According to Dhanika's citations Prāpti and Samādhāna occur before Vilobhana in the Act I of the V-sam.
- 7 Abhi. śaku. p. 33. *nanvaṅgoddeśa-vākye upakṣepa-parikara ...ityuddiṣṭam | udāharāṇe ca kathāṃ vyatyaya iti cet | naiṣa doṣaḥ |* p. 114. *atra pratimukhasandhau...aṅgāni noktāni | kānicit vyatyayenāpyuktāni tat kathamiti na vācyam | bharatā-dibhireva tathokteḥ |*
- 8 Mā. ag. Vilobhana is in p. 32 whereas Yukti is located in p. 27.

- 9 NS. GOS. Vol. III. pp. 36-37. *kānicidaṅgāni svarūpabalādeva niyamabhāñji yathopakṣepo mukhasandhāveva* |
- 10 NLRK. II. 904-905.
- 11 NLRK. II. 905-909. NS. GOS. XIX. 104-105, 105-106.
 1) *yathāsaṁdhi tu kartavyānyaṅgānyetāni nātake* |
 2) *kavibhiḥ kāvyakuśalāi rasabhāvam apekṣya ca* ||
 3) *saṁmiśrāṇi kadācit syurdvi-tri-saṁkhyā pramānataḥ* |
 4) *jñātvā kāryam avasthām ca saṁdhiṣvaṅgāni nātake* ||
 The GOS. text reads the third line as : *saṁmiśrāṇi kadācittu dvitriyogena vā punaḥ* | RB. (Abhi. śaku. p. 114) quotes second and third lines and attributes them to Ādibharata. He reads the third line as *sarvāṅgāni kadācittu dvitrihīṇāni vā punaḥ* | He also quotes a part of another verse as : *vyutkrameṇāpi kāryāṇi* in the same context and this is not found in the NS.
- 12 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 62. *tenaikam api sandhyaṅgam tatraiva sandhau dvistrirvā kartyavyam* | The ND. maintains the same opinion. Cf. ND. p. 102. *tenaikamapyāṅgam rasapoṣakatvād ekasmīnnapi sandhau dvistrirvā nibadhyate* |
- 13 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 63. *tathā dvayoryogo dvābhyām aṅgābhyām sampādyam tadekenaiva ced ghaṭate tat kim apareṇa|evam triyogaḥ* | Cf. ND. p. 102. *tathāṅgadvayena sādhyam yadekenaiva sidhyati, tadekameva nibadhyate* |
- 14 ND. p. 102.
- 15 NLRK. I. 903.
- 16 See fn. 11. supra.
- 17 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 37. *sambhavamātram eṣāmuktam na tu niyamaḥ* |
- 18 Bhā-pra. p. 214. l. 1. Śdt. here (ll. 2-3) informs us that according to Bhoja all the aṅgas should be used by the experts. But the Śr. pra. (Vol. II. p. 505) says : *saṁvi-dhāna-vaśācca nyūnādhikabhāvena vyutkrameṇa ca prayogaḥ* |
- 19 RS. III. 78.

Necessity and Nature of the Sandhyaṅgas

- 1 Dr Kulkarni. The conception of Sandhis in Sanskrit

drama, JOI. Vol. V. No. 4. p. 379 ; Dr Mainkar. The TSS. p. 18.

2 See discussion of Sandhis and application of the Sandhyaṅgas.

3 See the view of Ag. discussed supra.

4 The Vṛttis. JOR. Vol. VII. part I. p. 45.

5 NŚ. GOS. XIX. 51-52. Cf. DR. I. 55 ; SD. VI. 116-117.

6 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. pp. 32-33.

7 ND. p. 102. *sarvasandhinām cāṅgānītvṛttāvicchedārtham upādīyate itivṛttasyāvicchedaśca rasapuṣṭyarthah, vicchede hi sthāyyādestruṣṭitāt vāt kutastyo rasāsvādah? tato rasa-vidhānaikatāna-cetasah kaveḥ prayatnāntarānapekṣam yadaṅgam ujñimbhate taddevopanibaddham sahrdayānām hrdayam ānandayati |*

8 NŚ. GOS. XIX. 105 ; NLRK. I. 907.

9 Dh. ā. III. 12., also quoted by Ag. (NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 42) *sandhisandhyaṅgaghaṭanam rosābhivyaktyapekṣayā* (Abhi-bhā. reads *rasabandhavyapekṣayā*) | *na tu kevalayā śāstrasthitisampādanecchayā* (Abhi-bhā. *na tu kevalaśāstrārtha* etc.) || Cf. also SD. VI. 120.

10 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 42.

11 Keith. The Skt. Dr. pp. 299-300.

12 Bhā-pra. pp. 238-241.

13 Bhā-pra. p. 239. l. 1.

14 RS. III. 213-214. *nāṭakasya tu pūrṇādibhedāḥ kecana kalpitāḥ | teṣāṃ nāṭīva ramyatvādaparīkṣākṣamatvaḥ || muninānādṛtatvācca tānuddēṣṭumudāmahe |* The Sañ dā (p. 96. last two lines) also refers to the view. But Śubhaṅkara wrongly understands the names of above five types as those of five Sandhis. He reads : *samagram iti vijñeyā nāṭake pañca sandhayaḥ* instead of Śdt.'s (Bhā-pra. p. 238. l. 17)...*nāṭake pañca jātayaḥ |*

15 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. pp. 34-36.

16 See next Chap. for the Theory of Sandhyantaras.

17 NŚ. GOS. Vol. II. pp. 295-296. *anye manyante-itivṛttakhaṇḍalakānyeva sandhyaṅgakāni lakṣaṇānīti ca vyapadīśyante |*

- 18 Kā. a. II. 367. *yacca sandhyaṅga-vṛtṭyaṅga-lakṣaṇādyā-gamāntare | vyāvarṇitam idaṃ ceṣṭam alaṅkāratayaiva naḥ ||*
 19 Dr Raghavan, SCAS, p. 25.

Chapter VI

- 1 NS. GOS. XIX. 107-109. p. 63. f.n. 3.
 2 Śr. pra. Vol. II. pp. 498-503.
 3 ND. p. 102.
 4 Bhā-pra. p. 214. ll. 7-11.
 5 RS. pp. 238-243 ; NC. pp. 34-40.
 6 Sañ. dā. p. 98 ; NLRK. I. 923. Cf. NLRK. (I. 904) where they are called *Sandhyantara-pradeśas*.
 7 NLRK. I. 923. *eteṣāṃ eva saṃdhinām ekaviṃśati-pradeśā arthavaśād bhavanti |* ll. 930-931. *prayojanavaśādyāvanta ete pradeṣṭuṃ śakyante tāvantaḥ saṃdhiṣu prādarśayitavyāḥ |*
 8 RS. III. 92-94. p. 247.
 9 NS. GOS. XIX. 106. *eteṣāmeva cāṅgānām sambaddhānyarthayuktitaḥ | sandhyantarāṇi etc. ||*
 10 RS. III. 79. *mukhādi-sandhiṣvaṅgānām aśaithilyaṃ pratiyate |* NC. (p. 34) reads...*aṅgānām aśaithilyāya sarvataḥ |*
 11 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 63. *tena sandhyaṅga-chhidravartitvat sandhyantarāṇi, ata eva cāṅgānām sambaddhāni |*
 12 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 63. *anye manyante ya evopakṣepādyaḥ sāmānyā uktāḥ teṣāṃ evaitadviśeṣā ayāntarabhedāḥ |* This view seems to be referred to in the RS. (III. 95) when the author says : *sandhyantarāṇām aṅgesu nāntarbhāvo mato mama |*
 13 NS. GOS. Vol. III. pp. 63-64.
 14 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 64. *ete ca vibhāvānubhāva-vyabhicāri-rūpa eva | prayogojjvalatvopayogāya tūpalakṣṇatvenaika-viṃśatirityuktam |*
 15 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 64.
 16 DR. IV. 84. cf. also Avaloka on the verse.
 17 ND. p. 102.
 18 NLRK. II. 994-996. *saṃdhinām antare cākāśā-puruṣa-*
 19a

vacanāni lekhyoktyā (ms. reads,—*lekhoktayā*) *vidhātavyāḥ* / *yadāha* / *lekhyoktirākāśa-vacanam antarā saṁdhiṣviti* / Śubhaṅkara also records this view and probably from the NLRK. The Sañ. dā (p. 99) reads, *lekhoktirākāśa-vacanam-antarā sandhiṣu smṛtam*. Dr Raghavan (NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 63) takes the *ākāśa-puruṣa-vacanāni* as the definition of the *lekhyokti* and prefers the reading *lekhyoktayaḥ* (NLRK. Eng. Tr. p. 72). The reading *lekhyoktayaḥ*, however, seems to be the correct one but it may be taken to mean reading of letters. Cf. RS. III. 91. In the list of twenty-one Sandhyantaras Sāgara omits *Lekha* and here he seems to have included it.

- 19 NLRK. I. 1039. The text reads *svapnobbhūtam*. Dr Raghavan (NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 72) suggests *svapnodūtaḥ* and this seems to be a better reading. A further improvement may be suggested as: *dūto*. In another place (I. 2280) Sāgara enjoins that the entrance of minor characters, having a little to perform on the stage, should be avoided with the help of the devices *Ākāśavāk*, *Nepathyokti* and *Lekha*.
- 20 NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 63.
- 21 Abhi-śaku. p. 20.
- 22 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 63. f.n. 5 na.
- 23 RS. III. 80.
- 24 ND. p. 102.
- 25 NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 63. Dr Raghavan on the basis of the statements of the ND. and DR. supposes that they are post-Bharatan. But the expression Post-Bharatan itself requires elucidation in the face of the still unsettled problem relating to the identity of Bharata or Ādi-bharata. Moreover it is yet to be finally decided what portion of the present NS. is pre-Bharatan, what is Bharatan and what is post-Bharatan.
- 26 Cf. NLRK. II. 935. *bhedāḥ pṛthag-bhāvaḥ* / 940. *damaṇaṁ daṇḍaḥ* / 942. *vaḍho vyāpādaḥ* / 949. *gotra-skhalitaṁ nāmān-tara-graṇaṁ* / 957. *bhayaṁ bhūtiḥ* / 965. *krodhaḥ kopaḥ* /

977. *bhrāntir-bhramah* | 983. *dūtaḥ sandeśa-haraḥ* | 984. *upadhiśchalanam* |
- 27 NLRK. I. 937.
- 28 NLRK. II. 963-964.
- 29 NLRK. II. 967-970. As an illustration of Rujā, Sāgara quotes (II. 971-972) a verse that seems to be apparently taken from the *Mṛcchakaṭikam* (Act. IX. II). The reading differs very much from that of the printed text of the drama.
- 30 Cf. Abhi-śaku, Ed. Godbole. pp. 37 Daṇḍa ; 83 Saṃvṛti, 105 Sāma ; 102 Lekha ; 174 Hetvavadhāraṇa ; 216 Bhrānti ; 217 Citra ; 223 Bhaya ; 225 Ojas, Krodha.

Chapter VII

- 1 NLRK. II. 1000-1001.
- 2 NS. GOS. XIX. 30. p. 18. fn. 5.
- 3 NLRK. II. 1003-1005. The *Daśarathāṅka* is referred to once more in the NLRK. II. 1782-1785. Nothing more is known either about the play or its author. The two citations in the NLRK. indicate that the play begins with the exile of Rāma.
- 4 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 19.
- 5 DR. I. 14.
- 6 DR. Avaloka. p. 4. *tacca tulyetivṛttatayā tulya-viśeṣaṇatayā ca dviprakāram, anyokti-samāsokti-bhedāt* |
- 7 Bhā-pra. p. 203. II. 3-4 ; RS. p. 211. III. 16, 17 ; NC. pp. 55-57.
- 8 ND. pp. 40-41.
- 9 NLRK. II. 1008-1009. This is Sāgara's gloss on the definition taken from the NS. (GOS. XIX. 31), I. 1007. Sāgara reads *niṣpatti* in place of *sampatti* in the NS.
- 10 NLRK. II. 1010-1013 ; NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 20. Cf. also ND. p. 40.
- 11 NLRK. II. 1015-1017 ; NS. GOS. XIX. 32. The SD. (VI.

- 47) reads *nānābandhasamāśrayam* in place of *kāvya-bandha-samāśrayam* of the NS. and the NLRK.
- 12 NLRK. I. 1020, Cf. SD. below VI. 47. Tārānātha Tarkavācaspati (V-sam. Ed. Jivananda. p. 10) takes the verse to be an illustration of Śleṣa-gaṇḍa.
- 13 NLRK. II. 1021-1024 ; NS. GOS. XIX. 33. *savinayam* in the definition has been taken by Sāgara to mean *auddhatyam apāśya* but Abhinava interprets it as *viśeṣa-niścaya-prāptiṣā sahitam*. Viśvanātha (SD. below VI. 48) follows Abhinava.
- 14 NLRK. II. 1026-1029.
- 15 Cf. Ahi-bhā. NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 21 ; Śr. pra. (Vol. II). p. 504.
- 16 Abhi-śaku. p. 151. *tallakṣaṇam uktam mātṛguptācāryaiḥ arthopkṣepaṇam yattu gūḍham savinayam bhavet | śliṣṭa-pratyuttaropetaṁ tṛtīyaṁ tanmatam tathā ||* RB. quotes the same verse and ascribes it to Mātṛgupta in another place of his commentary on the Abhi-śaku (p. 123) but here the reading is a bit corrupt.
- 17 NLRK. II. 1033-1035 ; NS. GOS. XIX 34. The NS. reads the third foot as : *upanyāsa-sujuktaśca* instead of *upapatyā samprayuktaḥ* of the NLRK. A ms. of the NS. (GOS. Vol. III. p. 21. na) reads *upapatyā yutam yacca*. The reading in the SD. (VI. 49) is *pradhānārthāntarākṣepi*.
- 18 NLRK. II. 1036-1037.
- 19 Śr. pra (Vol. II). p. 504 ; Bhā-pra. p. 203. II. 5-6 ; RS. p. 213 ; SD. below VI. 49.
- 20 DR. Avaloka. p. 4.
- 21 NS. GOS. Vol. III. pp. 21-22.
- 22 NPSD. p. 72.
- 23 Bhā-pra. p. 201. II. 11-12. The Bhā-pra. however, (p. 202. l. 9) rightly says that the Patākāsthānakas are *sūcanopayas*.
- 24 NLRK. I. 997. *kāvyaśyālamkārahūtāni* / I. 998. *patākāsthānāni śobhāhetūni* |
- 25 NS. GOS. XIX. 36.

- 26 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 19. *anyābhisandhāne anyasiddhiścet bhūṣaṇabhūtāpi kaiscid dūṣaṇatvena grhītā |*
- 27 ND. pp. 39, 41.
- 28 LPD. p. 80. fn. 4.
- 29 NLRK. I. 998. *nirvahaṇasandhi-varjaṃ kāryāṇi |*
- 30 NLRK. I. 1038.
- 31 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 20. *anye tu catuṣpatākā-paramam iti bhāvisandhi-catuṣṭayābhiprāyeṇa manyamānāḥ prathamadvītyādī-śabdān mukhādisandhi-viśaya-prayogābhi-prāyeṇa vyācakṣate|atra ca yuktir na lakṣyate, na vā camatkāraṃ bhajatītyasadeva |*
- 32 SD. p. 344. *etāni...sarvasandhiṣu bhavanti | kāvya-karturicchāvaśād bhūyo bhūyo'pi bhavanti |* p. 345. *yat punaḥ kenacid uktaṃ mukha-sandhim ārabhya sandhi-catuṣṭaye krameṇa bhavantīti tadanye na manyante, eṣāṃ atyantam upādeyānām aniyamena sarvatrāpi sarveṣāṃapi bhavitum yuktatvāt |*
- 33 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 22. *caturṣu sandhiṣu catvāraḥ patākā-nāyakāḥ, teṣāṃ yathākramaṃ sūcakāni patākāsthānāni | prathamam mukhasandhau yāvaccaturtham avamarśa-sandhāvīti, taccāsat |*
- 34 NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 20.
- 35 Abhi-śaku. p. 110.
- 36 Abhi-śaku. pp. 40-41. The definition is very similar to that of the NS.

Chapter VIII

- 1 NLRK. I. 237.
- 2 NLRK. II. 242-244.
- 3 NLRK. I. 241.
- 4 NS. GOS. XVIII. 14. Two mss. read *gūḍha-śabdo* and *cinhayatyarthān* for *rūḍhī-śabdo* and *rohayatyarthān* respectively. It is interesting to note here that Rāghava-bhaṭṭa attributes this verse in his *Arthadyotanika* (Abhi-śaku. p. 54) to the same context.

- 5 NS. GOS. Vol. II. p. 415.
- 6 Mm. P. V. Kane (HSP. p. 50) and Dr Raghavan (NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 61) maintain that the reading of the hemistich according to Lollaṭa is : *aṅka iti gūḍha-śabdo bhāvaiḥ rasaiśca rohayatyarthān*. But Abhinava distinctly says, *anye rohayatyarthān iti paṭhanti*, as quoted above. Moreover according to Lollaṭa, as informed by Abhinava *aṅka* is a *yādṛcchikaśabda* which meaning comes from *rūḍhi-śabda*.
- 7 Cf. Abhi-bhā. Vol. II. p. 415. *utsaṅgavadārohanam (na ?) sambandhādaṅka ityucyate |*
- 8 DR. p. 70. *utsaṅga ivāṅkaḥ* ; RS. III. 197. p. 233 ; Bhā-pra. p. 235. l. 11.
- 9 NS. GOS. Vol. II. p. 415, p. 418. *aneka-rasāṅkitatvādapi aṅka iti nāmetyarthah |*
- 10 NLRK. II. 238-239. *sa ca sandhyāṅgavaśād asyaiva nāṭaka-syāvasthāṃ prasamīkṣya bindvādinām vistarād vā kartavyaḥ |* This is based on NS. GOS. XVIII. 13.
- 11 NLRK. II. 239-240 ; NS. GOS. XVIII. 29. *prakaraṇa-nāṭakaviśaye pañcādyā daśaparā bhavantyaṅkāḥ |*
- 12 NS. GOS. Vol. II. p. 415. *itivr̥ttasya bindu-sūtra-syūtasya prārambhadyāvasthā-pañcaka-cārīṇo yadā prārambhāvasthā pūrṇatvam eti tadāṅkacchedo bindudvārānusandhīyamāna-dvītyāṅkābhidheyarūpo vidheyah | evam prayatnādyavasthācatuṣṭaye'pi vācyam iti pañcatāvad aṅkā iti mukhyah kalpaḥ |* Kohala also, as informs Śdt. (Bhā-pra. p. 236. l. 18) enjoins the use of Bindu at the close of an Aṅka.
- 13 NS. GOS. Vol. II. p. 415. *yadā prārambhāvadhipradhānaṃ bhavātīti tadā tasyā evopakramopasaṃhārāvasthādvayāpekṣayā dvāvaṅkau, anyāsām ekaikāṅkateti yāvat sarvāsām avasthādvayayogena sampādanam iti śaḍaṅkatvāt prabhṛti saptaṭātaprāptau (?) daśāṅkatvam |*
- 14 NS. GOS. Vol. II. p. 416. *prārambhādyavasthālakṣaṇo' rtho yatra samāpyate soṇ'kaḥ |* Cf. also pp. 421-422. *sandhyavasthānaparipūrṇopanibaddha evāṅka etc.*
- 15 SD. below VI. 80. p. 358.

- 16 ND. pp. 32, 49.
- 17 Mu. rā. Ed. Telang. pp. 62, 72, 107-108, 219.
- 18 Abhi-śaku. p. 15. *atra tataḥ praviṣati ityārabhya dvitīyāṅke ubhau parikramyopaviṣṭau ityantena sārḍhāṅkena mukha-sandhiḥ* | p. 115. *atha caturthāṅkāḍipāñcama-madhye yathoktam karoti ityantena garbha-sandhiruktaḥ* |
- 19 ND. p. 32.
- 20 ND. I. 19 p. 31. *asamāptāyām apyavasthāyām kāryavaśena yo vā chedaḥ khaṇḍanam so'ṅkaḥ* | But again (pp. 31-32) it says : *amunā vṛddhasampradāyā-tenāṅkalakṣaṇena vakṣyamāna-nītyā aṅka-saṁkhyā-parimāṇam upapādyate* | *ye tu vṛddha-saṁpradāyam avadhūyāṅkamadhye'pyavasthām samāpayanti* | etc.
- 21 The Skt. Dr. p. 345. Keith here in the foot note (2) points out "Ghanaśyāma's *Navagrahacarita* has three acts; Madhusūdana's *Jānakīpariṇaya* has four". The Bombay recension of the *Mahānāṭaka* has fourteen Aṅkas. Viśva-nātha (SD. VI. 223-224) maintains that a *Mahānāṭaka* should contain ten Aṅkas.
- 22 The *Mahānāṭaka* Problem, IHQ., Vol. X. 1934. pp. 493-508.
- 22a NLRK. II. 245-246 ; NS. GOS. XVIII. 16. The verse is also quoted in the Bhā-pra. p. 235. II. 12-13. Narahari in his commentary on the Abhi-śaku (p. 310) quotes from the *Kavi-kaṇṭha-hāra* : *prakṛtārthasya nirvāhaḥ tathā bijasya saṁgatih* | *kiṁcit saṁlagnabinduḥ syād yatra so'ṅka iti smṛtaḥ* || This is very similar to the above verse from the NS.
- 23 NLRK. II. 247-248.
- 24 NS. GOS. Vol. II. p. 416. *prārambhādyavasthā-lakṣaṇo'r-tho yatra samāpyate so'ṅkaḥ* | *evam aṅka-svarūpam anena nirūpitaṁ iti cirantanāḥ* | *taccāitat punaruktam, "asyāvasthopetaṁ kāryam."* (XVIII. 13) *ityanena hi kiya-nmoktaṁ yadanena lakṣaṇenābhidhīyate* |
- 25 NS. GOS. Vol. II. pp. 416-417.

- 26 NLRK. II. 249-250 (taken from the NS. GOS. XVIII. 17). 251-254; SD. VI. 11.
- 27 NLRK. II. 271-272. Abhinava (NS. GOS. Vol. II. p. 418) also in the same context takes the word *nāyaka* to signify both the main hero and leading characters. Viśvanātha (SD. VI. 11. p. 322) uses the word *kāryavyāpṛta-puruṣāḥ* to mean the leading characters as distinguished from the *Nāyaka*, the main hero.
- 28 NS. GOS. XVIII. 28. The NLRK. (II. 269-270) shortens the hemistich as : *sannihitanāyako'ṅkaśca kāryaḥ* |
- 29 NLRK. II. 273-278. The names of the Aṅkas of the V. sam. are given here as : Pratijñābhīma (Act I), Bhānumatī (Act. II), Aśvathāmā (Act. III), Sundara (Act. IV), Dhṛtarāṣṭra (Act. V) and Saṃhāra (Act. VI).
- 30 NLRK. II. 254-256. *nāyaka-devī-parijana-purohitāmātya-sārthavāhānām naika-rasāntara-vihitaścarita-sambhogo'pya-ṅkaḥ sa veditavyaḥ* | This is almost the same as NS. GOS. XVIII. 18. The first half of the Āryā ends with *sārthavāhānām* and the portion *carita-sambhoga* from the second half is to be deleted. Śāradātanaya (Bhā-pra. p. 235. II. 7-8) also quotes this verse with a minor difference in reading in the second half. Abhinava (NS. GOS. Vol. II. p. 418) takes *sārthāvaha* of the verse to mean both commander and merchant.
- 31 NLRK. II. 279-280, 285-286; NS. GOS. XVIII. 20, 38. One ms. (Pa) reads the first verse as : *śoka-prasāda-vidra-vaśāpotsarga-prasādhana-krodhāḥ | utsāho'dbhuta-darśana-maṅkalī pratyakṣajāni syuḥ* || This is the reading adopted by Bhoja (Śr. pra. Vol. II. p. 462) with a bit difference in the second half as, *udvāho'dbhuta-darśanam aṅke*.
- 32 NLRK. I. 282. *śāpotsargaḥ śāpapradānam* |
- 33 NS. GOS. Vol. II. 419. *śāpotsargaḥ śāpakṛtasyānarthasya nāśaḥ* | It may be noted here that Durvāsas in the *Abhiśaku* does not enter the stage but pronounces his curse from behind the screen and that also happens in a Viṣkambhaka. The ND. (p. 31) also follows *Abhi-bhā*.

- 34 NS. GOS. Vol. II. pp. 418-419. *na kevalam caritasam-bhogāveva pratyakṣam kintvanyadapi yatra rañjanātīśayo stīti darśayannāha krodhaprasāda-śoka iti* |
- 35 ND. p. 31.
- 36 NLRK. I. 287. *yuddhādikaṃ nāñke pratyakṣam kartavyam | praveśakaireva vaktavyam* | After this Sāgara (NLRK. II. 288-290) refers to the *Kumbhāṅka* where fighting with the seize of a town, *Prāvṛḍāṅka* where death, and a hitherto unknown play *Nalavijaya* where the loss of kingdom, have been reported in *Praveśakas*. *Kumbhāṅka* is the Act V of the *Udāttarāghova* (cf. notes of Dr Raghavan, NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 61). The SD. refers to this Act once below VI. 200 which occurs in the NLRK. (I. 1807) in the same contexts as an illustration of *Udyama*, a *Nāṭyālaṅkāra*. There are two more citations from the *Prāvṛḍāṅka* in the NLRK. (II. 3046-3052). The play *Nalavijaya* has been referred to only in the NLRK. once.
- 37 NS. Eng. Tra. Vol. I. p. 358.
- 38 NS. KSS. XX. 20. cf. also NS. GOS. Vol. II. p. 419. ms. reading 5 (*bha*).
- 39 NS. KS. XX. 20, 21 ; KM. XVIII. 20, 21. *Rucipati* (*Anrā*. p. 53) also supports this reading and interpretation.
- 40 *Vidrava* is an *aṅga* of the *Garbhasandhi*. Cf. the definition of the *Vidrava* in the NLRK. II. 283, 766. *Abhinava* (NS. GOS. Vol. III. p. 52) gives the same definition of *Vidrava* and illustrates it.
- 41 Haas, DR. p. 93 ; Keith, *The Skt. Dr.* pp. 292, 300 ; C. B. Gupta, *Ind. Thea.*, p. 130.
- 41a The deaths of *Daśaratha* (*Pratimā*), *Vālin* (*Abhiṣeka*). *Ariṣṭa*, *Cānura*, *Muṣṭika* and *Kaṃasa* (*Bālacarita*) are all depicted in Acts for visible representation.
- 42 DR. III. 34, 36 ; *Avaloka* p. 71 ; *Bhā-pra.* pp. 236. II. 7-13, 217. II. 10-11 ; ND. pp. 33. 131 ; SD. VI. 16, 63.
- 43 NS. GOS. XVIII. 39-40.
- 44 NS. GOS. Vol. II. p. 427.

- 45 NS. GOS. Vol. II. p. 427. *anye tu khyātaṃ nāyakaṃ patākānāyakādikaṃ icchanti |... yastu nāyakastasya khyā-tasya na ghātanādi pradarśanīyam |*
- 46 NLRK. II. 290-291. This is based on the NS. GOS. XVIII 39-40.
- 47 NLRK. II. 291-295. *etattu nāṭake nātyantikam | yato rāvaṇa-duryodhanakamśādīnām vadha eva sa tu na sākṣā-tkartavya ityārthaḥ | prakaraṇe punaḥ kaveḥ svātantrantryāt sandhyādiḥ sakṛdviśayaḥ | yathā cārudatta (...dattasya) rāṣṭriyeṇa saha samdhiरेva darśitaḥ |*
The NS. (GOS. XVIII. 82) while describing the Ihāmṛga also says : *yatra tu vadhepsītānām vadho hyudagro bhaved-dhi puruṣāṇām | kiñcid vyājam kṛtvā teṣāṃ yuddham śamayitavyam ||*
- 48 NS. GOS. Vol. II. p. 426. *iha kecidāhuḥ maraṇam dvividham, kiñcidanyasambandhinyā kriyayā sampādyam yathā cakreṇa daityasya śiraśchedam, kiñcidanyasambandhikriyā-nairapekṣyeṇaiva vyādhyabhighātādi-prabhavam, tatrādyas-yaiva niṣedhaḥ kriyate |*
- 49 NS. GOS. Vol. II. p. 426. *idam maraṇam prayojyam idamaprayojyam iti na tāvadatra viśaya-vibhāge nidānam utpaśyāmaḥ | mṛtasya katham niṣkramaṇam katham vāvas-thānam, tato nātyopayogi..... prakriyāvilopaḥ sāmājikānām virasatā-pratīpattiriti tu sarvatra maraṇam samānam tasmād raṅge maraṇam aprayojyam eva |... p. 427. kiñca yatra pratyāpattiśūnyam maraṇam tat prakriyāvilopa-katvānna prayojyam | yattu kvacit pratyāpattiḥ yathā jīmū-tavāhanasya tadeva.....maraṇānubhāva-sākṣātkaraṇasya viśa-yaḥ | ...anye tvāhuḥ vyādhijam abhighātajam ca maraṇam range prayogyam, apunarjani-niṣkrānti-rahita-prakṛtir vidhe-yeti*
- 50 NS. GOS. XVIII. 38. Sāgara (NLRK. I. 287) takes *sam-vidheyāni* to mean 'to be reported' (*vaktavyam*) but the word may also be taken to mean 'to be performed.'
- 51 NS. Eng. Tra. Vol. I. p. 358. f.n. 20, 21.
- 52 NS. GOS. XXII. 240-241. The KSS. (XXIV. 232) and

the KM. (XXII. 232) editions read the first foot of the first verse as : *nāsva-graṇam raṅge* and this may be taken to mean the prohibition of croaking or indistinct voice. The GOS. reading, however, gives a better sense.

53 NS. GOS. XXII. 295-299.

54 The same criterion seems to be taken up in describing the *Aślilatva-doṣa* by rhetoricians also. Cf. SD. p. 472. *aślilatvaṃ vr̥dājuguṣṭmaṅgalavyañjakatyāt trividham |*

54 NS. GOS. X. 86-88.

56 NS. GOS. VII. 86-88 and prose portions (pp. 372-373) ; XXV. 100-110. The concluding line says : *evam hi nāṭya-dharme maraṇāni budhaiḥ prayojyāni |*

57 NS. GOS. XVIII. 38 (quoted before). Sāgara while illustrating *Vidrava* due to *puroparodha* says : *mṛcchakaṭikāyam aṛyakānusaṇe puroparodhaḥ* (NLRK. II. 2815-2816). This may refer to the commotion indicated from *nepathya* in Act IV when Śarvilaka is leaving the house of *Vasanta-senā* with *Madanikā*, or more suitably the situation depicted in the Act VI beginning from the entrance of *Āryaka*. But even the second one cannot be taken as a visible representation of actual *nagaroparodha*. The whole effect of a serious commotion, of course very successfully, has been produced by mainly two characters (*Viraka* and *Candanaka*) on the stage with other two (*Vardhamānaka* and *Āryaka*), playing here minor roles and others remaining behind the screen.

58 DR. III. 34-35. *dūrādhvānam vadham yuddham rājya-deśa-dibiplavam || samrodham bhojanam snānam suratam cānulepanam | ambara-graṇādini pratyakṣāni na nirdiśet ||* The *Avoloka* here says : *praveśakādibhireva sūcayet |* Bhā-pra. p. 236. II. 7-9 quotes the DR. verbatim.

59 SD. VI. 36-38.

60 NLRK. I. 296. The text reads :...*anke samprayo*..... Dr Raghavan's emendation (NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 72) is accepted above. NS. (GOS. XVIII. 21) reads : *ekadivasa-pravṛttam kāryastvaṅka'rtha-bijam adhikṛtya |*

61 NLRK. I. 297.

- 62 NŚ. GOS. Vol. II. p. 420. *ckadivasa-sampāditamupayogi ceṣṭitamāṅke badhnīyāt !*
- 63 DR. III. 36 ; Bhā-pra. p. 236. l. 14, p. 237. l. 15 ;
- 64 NŚ. GOS. XVIII. 21-22, SD. VI. 14 ; Bhā-pra. p. 233. l. 11.
- 65 NLRK. II. 298-299.
- 66 Bhā-pra. p. 237. l. 16. *aṅka syād vāsarārdhena.....|*
- 67 RS. III. 205, p. 234. *dinārdha-dinayor yogyam aṅke vastu pravartayet |*
- 68 ND. p. 31. *muhūrtād ārabhya yāma-catuṣṭayam yāvat |* yāma or Prahara is one-eighth part of a day i.e., a period of three hours. Muhūrta corresponds to a period of about 48 minutes. This view of the ND. is also found in the NŚ. (GOS. XIII. 25) *kṣaṇo muhūrto yāmo vā divaso vāpi nāṭake | ekāṅke samvidhātavyo bijasyārtha-vaśānugaḥ ||* This verse, however, has not been taken into account by Abhinava.
- 69 NLRK. II. 299-302. Cf. NŚ. GOS. XVIII. 31. also XIII. 26.
- 70 Cf. SD. VI. 15. *nāneka-dina-nivartya-kathayā samprayojitaḥ*
- 71 NŚ. GOS. Vol. II. pp. 422-423.
- 72 NŚ. GOS. XVIII. 21, 26. Ag. (NŚ. GOS. Vol. II. pp. 421, 422) points out rightly, that here Praveśaka means any one of the five Arthopakṣepakas Cf. SD. VI. 53.
- 73 NŚ. GOS. XVIII. 31. *aṅkacchedam kṛtvā māsa-kṛtam varṣasamcitam vāpi tat sarvaṃ kartavyam varṣād ūrdham na tu kedācit ||* The SD. (VI. 51-52) quotes this verse below VI. 52, but reads : *aṅkacchede kāryam* as the first foot.
- 74 Abhi-bhā. NŚ. GOS. Vol. II. p. 423. *tena pañcāṅke nāṭake pañca kāryadinānūti samkṣepaḥ daśāṅke tu daśeti vistaraḥ |*
- 75 Bhavabhūti in his U-ca. depicts the incidents of a single day in five Acts (Acts II to VI), each Act (excepting Act V) having a Viṣkambhaka prefixed to it.
- 76 NLRK. II. 203-204. *nāhetukaḥ praveśo'ṅke kasyāpi jāyate*

*tvapi | niṣkrāntirapi tataḥ syād vyālamvārtham prasaṅgam
ca ||* The verse seems to be Sāgara's own as there is no
introductory expressihn like *yaducyate* etc., before it.

77 NLRK. II. 2279-2280, supra Sandhyantarās.

78 NLRK. II. 374-375 ; NŚ. GOS. XVIII. 41.

79 NLRK. II. 376-379. *nāyakasya tadvipakṣasya ca ye ye
mahājanāḥ pradhānabhūtāḥ | na te sārve nāṭaka-prakaraṇayoḥ
paricārakatvena vyāpārayitavyāḥ | teṣāṃ madhye kāryāva-
lambinaścātvaraḥ pañca vā kartavyāḥ | apare bahir eva
kāryataḥ kirtanīyāḥ | anke'pyeka eva nirvāhayitā|*

80 Not to speak of works like the *Mu-rā* or the *Mṛccha*,
even *U-Ca.* and *Abhi-śaku* also present a greater number
of characters on the stage.

81 SD. VI. 11.

82 NŚ. GOS. Vol. II. p. 428. *etad uktam bhavati bahutara-
puruṣasādhyam yat kiṃcid tadyathā samudre setubandhanam
ityādi, tat sarvaṃ pratyakṣena na pradarśanīyam | ...yadi
prakarṣastadā daśāṣṭau vā raṅge praviṣṭā bhavanti | tato'dhi-
keṣu tvabhinayacatuṣṭayam samyag avibhāvanīyam syāt
devayātrāparidṛśyamāna-jana-samājavat |* *Abhinava*, by
twisting the language of the verse also makes out another
meaning that all the indecent activities and those sus-
ceptible to offend the feeling of the audience are to be
strictly avoided on the stage. But the *Nāṭya-śāstra*
includes this injunction in other places, as has been
shown.

83 DR. III. 37 ; *Bhā-pra.* p. 236. l. 16 , ND. p. 32. The
ND. undoubtedly clarifies the matter best, of course,
following the *Abhi-bhā.*

84 NŚ. GOS. XVIII. 22, 24 , DR. III. 36, *Avaloka* p. 71.

85 NŚ. GOS. XVIII. 23 , DR. III. 37 , ND. I. 20 , *Bhā-
pra.* p. 236. l. 17 , SD. 19.

86 NŚ. GOS. Vol. II. p. 420. *tat parisamāptau yavaikayā
tirodhānarūpaṃ niṣkramaṇaṃ darśanīyam |* ND. p. 30.
niṣkramo yavanikayā tirodhānam |

87 The NŚ. (GOS. V. 11-12) divides the features of the

Pūrvaraṅga into two sets : one is to be done behind the screen and the other : *vighāṭya vai yavanikāṃ nṛtta-pāṭhya-kṛtāni tu* /. This along with the above remarks of the Abhi-bhā. and the ND. go to prove the existence of the front screen in ancient Indian stage. The problem has been elaborately discussed in Two Anonymous Precepts of Sanskrit Dramaturgy of the present writer in the Vishevsharanand Indological Journal, Vol. IX, II.

88 NŚ. GOS. XIII. The word is also spelt as *Kakṣā*.

89 NŚ. GOS. XXI.

90 See infra Naming of an Aṅka.

91 Cf. supra Aṅka.

92 NLRK. II. 379-382. *aṅke'apyeka eva nirvāhayitā kartavyaḥ | tasyaikasya krodha-śokādayaḥ pratyakṣabhuvo darśayitavyaḥ* | For illustration Sāgara cites the Aśvathāmāṅka.

93 DR. III. 36 The RS. also says the same (p. 284) in, *aṅkacchedaśca kartavyaḥ kālāvasthānurodhataḥ* |

94 SD. below VI. 80. p. 358.

Chapter XIX

1 NLRK. II. 308-309, (NŚ. GOS. XVIII. 33, repeated in XIX. 114) ; I. 344 (NŚ. GOS. XVIII. 36 ; Bhā-pra. p. 216. I. 15) II. 357-358, (NŚ. GOS. XVIII. 37). Sāgara's own comments ; II. 325-329, 359-361.

2 NŚ. GOS. Vol. II pp. 421, 422, 425. Below v. no. 36 (of the NŚ. XVIII. p. 425) Abhinava says : *aṅkārthasanniveśa-nimittam ye praveśakāḥ pañcapyuktāḥ...* |

3 NLRK. I. 307. Abhinava (GOS. Vol. II. p. 421) also says : "*adṛṣṭam apyartham hṛdi praveśayantīti praveśakāḥ*. Here the word *praveśaka* is used to denote all the Arthopakṣepakas. Cf. also ND (p. 35) : *apratyakṣānarthān sāmājīkahrdaye praveśayatīti praveśakāḥ* |

4 NLRK. II. 330-331.

5 Saṅ-dā. p. 72. *asūcitasya pātrasya praveśo naiva dṛśyate | ataḥ pradhāna-pātrāṇām sūcakaḥ syāt praveśakāḥ* ||

Rucipari quotes (An. rā. pp. 21. 108) *asūcitasya pātrasya praveśo naiva yujyate* and attributes it to Bharata. The full verse is quoted in p. 70 ; the second half is : *tato viṣkambhakenāsyā sūcanam racayed budah*, here it is ascribed to the *Saṅgītakalpataru*.

- 6 Vik. u. with the com. of Raṅganātha, p. 31. *tathā ca devapāñiviracita-daśarūpaka-ṭikāyām sāhasāṅkīya-ṭikā-sammatirapi*,—*na sūcitasya pātrasya praveśaḥ kvacid iṣyate | praveśam sūcayet tasmād amukhyāṅke praveśakāt |* We know nothing about these two sources of Raṅganātha.
- 7 Abhi-śaku. with the com. of Narahari, p. 329 ; Abhi. śaku. with the com. of RB. pp. 123, 192. *nāsūcitasya pātrasya praveśo nirgamo'pica*. RB. cites the view to explain the *apaṭikṣeṇa praveśa* of Anasūyā (Act. IV) and that of Kañcukin (Act. VI).
- 8 NLRK. I. 330. *yadāha-asūcitasya* etc.
- 9 Raṅganātha in Vik. u. Com. (p. 31) says : *adhamapātreṇa pātrābhyām vā prākṛta-bhāṣibhyām sūcayetivṛttasūcanam praveśakaḥ*. View of Rucipati has been quoted in f.n. 5 supra.
- 10 Narahari in his com. on the Abhi-śaku (p. 318) says : *anikeṣu pradhāna-pātra-praveśam sūcayānnadhama-pātrapraveśaḥ praveśakaḥ |*
- 11 NLRK. II. 336-337. We find no reason to amend the reading, Vyudāsa into Vyatysā as done by Dillon. Sāgara's gloss on *rasa-vyudāsārambha* (I. 341) is quite clear. The expression means the cessation, end (*vyudāsa*) of one Rasa and the beginning (*ārambha*) of the other i.e., a change of Rasa (*rasānām anyathākaraṇa*). The NS. (GOS. XVIII. 35) reads the verse : *kālatthāna-gatirasaḥ vyākhyā-samrambha-kārya-viśayāṇām | arthābhidhāna-yuktaḥ etc ||* Some mass., however read *vyatyāsa*. Cf. ms. readings 6 (*bha*) and 7 (*na*). The Bha-pa. (p. 216. l. 11) reads the first half of the verse as : *kālotthāpana-nagara-vyatyāsārambhakāma-viśayāṇām | Śr. pra. (vol. II. p. 462) reads :rasa vatyāsārambhakāma-viśayāṇām |*

- 12 NLRK. II. 340-342.
- 13 NS. GOS. Vol. II. pp. 424-425. Five uses are :- (1) *kālo-dayasūcana*, (2) *vyākhyārthābhidhāna*, (3) *saṃrambhār-thābhidhāna*, (4) *kāryārthābhidhāna*, (5) and *viṣayārthābhidhāna*. Abhinava concludes with the comment : *anyānyapi praveśakasya prayojyāni santi* |
- 14 NLRK. II. 334-335 ; NS. GOS. XVIII. 34 ; Bhā-pra. p. 216. II. 5-6 ; Śr. pra (Vol. II) p. 462.
- 15 NLRK. II. 338-339. *Śaktyaṅka* is an "Act of a Rāma play which may be *Kṛtyā-rāvaṇa*", suggests Dr Raghavan (NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 62) Sāgara refers to this Act in three other places, II. 388, 967, 1749. Dr Raghavan (SOLRP p. 101) notes "A fuller citation comprising two verses of Rāma's lament in this situation is given by Allarāja in his *Rasaratnapradīpikā* (p. 32)." and also quotes these two verses. The Act, as its name suggests, is related to the battle of *Laṅkā*, in which *Lakṣmaṇa* is hit down by *Rāvaṇa*'s *Śakti* weapon.
- 16 NS. GOS. Vol. II. p. 424.
- 17 DR. I. 60 ; SD. VI. 57.
- 18 ND. I. 25 ; RS. III. 194.
- 19 Śr. pra. Vol. II. p. 477. *praveśakaśca vijñeyah śaurasenyā dībhāṣayā* |
- 20 NLRK. I. 310 ; NS. GOS. XVIII. 28, reads *kathānu-bandhā*.
- 21 NLRK. II. 311-313. *parijanaḥ dāsi-kañcuki-prabhṛtayaḥ ...* |
... *ye nīca-madhamāste praveśakāḥ kartavyāḥ* ||
- 22 NS. GOS. Vol. II. p. 421.
- 23 NLRK. II. 314-316. *mātriguṇaḥ-ṛṣi-tāpasa-viprādyair-munikañcukibhiḥ* | *iti praveśakam varṇayati* |
- 24 NLRK. II. 342-343. *yadā ca tāpasādayaḥ praveśakāḥ santi tatra saṃskṛtapāṭha eva viśeṣaḥ* |
- 25 NLRK. II. 318-319. *raivatīpariṇaye tṛtiye'ṅke tāpasaḥ* | *abhijñāne tṛtiye vipraḥ* | *śaśikāmadatte tṛtiye viṣaḥ* | of the first and the third dramas we known nothing and in the NLRK. also, they are referred to only here in this context.

- 26 Cf. Abhi-śaku. p. 84. But Narahari seems to follow the view of Sāgara when he designates this scene as a *Praveśaka* (Abhi-śaku. p. 318).
- 27 Bhā-pra. p. 216. ll. 9-10. *viṭa tāpasa-vṛddhādyair-muni-Kaṇṇuki-bhistathā| praveśakam apīcchanti santaḥ saṃskṛtabhāṣibhiḥ||*. Cf. also ll. 7-8, containing the same idea. Śdt. reads *vṛddha* in place of NLRK's *vipra*.
- 28 Abhi-śaku. pp. 233, 318.
- 29 Cf. RT. chap. III. It is not unlikely that Śaṅkara means to attribute the view to Nānyadeva, the founder of the Kārṇāṭaka dynasty in Mithila, the homeland of Śaṅkara. Nānyadeva is known to be the author of a work called *Bharata-bhāṣya*. In the colophon of the ms. of the work (for details see RSP. by Mm. P. V. Kane, pp. 61-64) Nānyadeva is styled *Mahā-sāmantādhipati* and not *Mahārāja*.
- 30 NLRK. ll. 316-317. *anyastu|prakramādhīnaḥ praveśako nāma |*
- 31 NLRK. ll. 320-323. *prakramādhīnastu aśvatthāmāṅke yuddha-prastāvam adhikṛtya rākṣasaḥ|tayoṛ udāttam api vacanam|*
- 32 Supra. p. 243.
- 33 NS. GOS. Vol. II. p. 424. *anye tvāhuḥ :—udāttam svātma-kārya-viśrāntam vacanam niṣidhiyate, 'āṇattammi bhaṭṭi-dāriāe' ityādinā svakṛtyam pradhānopayogyeva drśyate |* Cf. also ND. pp. 34-35. *mukhya-nāyakādi-kārya-niṣṭhair na punaḥ sva-kṛtyaika-tatparaiḥ|yathā 'āṇatta' etc., as above.*
- 34 NLRK. ll. 321-323.
- 35 Dr Raghavan (NLRK. Eng. Tra. pp. 61-62) takes *udāttavacana* to mean elevated speech and observes, "If the *Praveśaka* is of the kind that gives in brief the sequel of the main story (*prakrama*), it has naturally to be elevated, if, however, it were to present the inferior characters in their own reaction to certain happenings, then the tone could not be elevated. But the speech cited by Sāgara, as *udāttavacana* goes to support the above inter-

pretation referred to as according to the opinion of others by Abhinava.

- 36 NLRK. II. 332-333. *sa cāṅkāntara-sandhiṣu kartavyaḥ | tatrāṅkāsyāḍau na tu madhyāntayorityarthaḥ |* This is evidently based on : *aṅkāntara-sandhiṣu ca praveśakasteṣu tāvantaḥ*, of the NŚ. (GOS. XVIII. 29).
- 37 DR. I. 61 ; Avaloka, p. 32. *aṅka-dvayasyānte iti prathamāṅke pratiṣedha iti |* SD. p. 348 ; RS. III. 194. p. 283.
- 38 ND. p. 35. *kecit praveśakam prathamāṅkāsyāḍau necchanti |*
- 39 Bhā-pra. p. 215. II. 6, 21.
- 40 NŚ. GOS. Vol. II, p. 423. *aṅkāntarānu-sārīti aṅka-(aṅkayor ?) madhye bhavati yāvat | aṅkāntaram pūrvāṅkāntaram anusarati... |*
- 41 VDP. XII. 13 (p. 314) *pātra-dvayena kartavyam tathā nityam praveśakam.*

II. Viṣkambhaka (Viṣkambha)

- 1 NŚ. GOS. XVIII. 54-55 ; KSS. XX. 37-38 ; KM. XVIII. 89-90.
- 2 NŚ. KSS. XX. 39 ; KM. XVIII. 91.
- 3 NŚ. GOS. XIX. 111-112, KSS. XXI. 109-110, KM. XIX. 109-110.
- 4 NŚ. GOS. Vol. II. p. 434. *nanu kohalena mukhāṅkāsyā cāyam antarāntare vihitāḥ | madhyama etc.* The reading of the second half is given here : *viṣkambhako hi kāryo nāṭakayoge praveśakavat |*
- 5 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 64. The problem will be discussed in our General review of the Arthopakṣepakas.
- 5a It is curious that the interlude at the beginning of the Act IV of Abhi-śaku has been taken to be a Śuddha Viṣkambhaka by Rāghava-bhaṭṭa, who says : (Abhi-śaku. p. 121) *ayamapi śuddha-viṣkambhaḥ kevalam prākṛteṇa kṛtatvāt |* Anusūyā and Priyamvadā, both speaking Prakrit, take part in this scene. Rāghava-bhaṭṭa perhaps, understands Śuddha-viṣkambhaka as one where only one language, either Sanskrit or Prakrit, is used. The two female characters here cannot be,

according to Rāghava-bhaṭṭa designated as *nica-pātra*. Narahari (p. 329) and Abhirāma (p. 152) take this scene as a *Praveśaka*.

- 6 NS. GOS. Vol. II. pp. 421, 422 (com. on XVIII. 29) *praveśaka-śabdaśca mahā-sāmānya-vacanaḥ pañcaśu vṛttaḥ, iha tu madhyama-sāmānye praveśaka-viṣkambhakadvaye vartate* |
- 7 Śr. Pra (Vol. II. pp. 462-463) simply quotes from the NS.
- 8 DR. I. 59-61, SD. VI. 55-57, ND. I. 23-25, RS. III. 178-181, 194-196. The Bhā-pra. (pp. 215-216) includes all the divergent views. But it defines the Viṣkambhaka first.
- 9 NLRK. I. 364. Cf. Ra-ca (Abhi-śaku. p. 70) *praveśaka eva viṣkambhakaḥ* |
- 10 NLRK. II. 371-372. Sāgara (II. 372-373) cites the illustration of Śuddha-viṣkambhaka from the Mā-mā (Act IX) and Saṅkīrṇa-viṣkambhaka from the *Rāmānanda* where a Kṣapaṇaka and a Kāpālīka take part. The SD. (below VI. 56) also cites the same illustration, but the name of the drama is stated there as *Rāmābhinanda*. NLRK. refers to the name *Rāmānanda* again in I. 385. From the Act *kṣapaṇaka-kāpālīka* there are two more citations below II. 3113 and 3117. Citations from the drama also occur in the RS., Śr. pra. and the Bhā-pra. where a Śrīgadita *Rāmānanda* is also referred to. For details see SOLRP. pp. 82-87.
- 11 NLRK. II. 365-368.
- 12 Bhā-pra. p. 215. II. 15-16. In the first half Śdt. reads *sambandho* in place of *sambaddho* of above. The second half there, is read as : *viṣkambhārthaḥ sa vijñeyaḥ kathām-śasyāpi sūcakaḥ* || Śubhaṅkara's reading (Saṅ. dā. p. 72) tallies exactly with that of Sāgara excepting in *saṅgato* instead of *sambaddho*.
- 13 Jagaddhara's reading (Mā. mā. p. 37) of the fourth foot is : *yastu (samyak) kāvyārtha-sūcakaḥ* | Rucipati (An. rā. p. 70) gives the verse with Sāgara's reading. Śaṅkara (Abhi-śaku. p. 208) reads the verse as : *yataḥ kutaścid āyātaḥ sambandhī nobhayorapi* | *viṣkambhakaḥ sa vijñeyaḥ*

kathāmātrasya sūcakaḥ ||

- 14 NLRK. I. 368. Here a citation is given from the *Nāgavarmāṅka* of an unknown drama.
- 15 NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 62.
- 16 NS. GOS. Vol. II. p. 433 ; ND. p. 34. *viṣkabhnātyanusandhānena vṛttam upastambhayatīti viṣkambhakaḥ |*
- 17 NS. GOS. Vol. II. 434. The verse attributed to Kohala has been quoted before. Bhā-pra. p. 215. I. 22. *niveśaḥ prathamāṅke'pi viṣkambhasyāvadhāryate |* p. 216. I. 1. *ādau viṣkambhakaṃ kuryād iti bhojena darśitam |* ND. p. 34. *kohalaḥ punar etam prathamāṅkādvēvecchati |*
- 18 NS. GOS. Vol. II. p. 434. *tathāhi bijaṃ binduśca prathamam upakṣipeyte, tatra ca prthag-janasyālabdha-niveśatvāt sacivādi-gocaratvācca tadupakṣepe viṣkambhakasyaivāvasara iti yad ucyate tadāṅkāntareṣvapi mantraguptatāyām tulyam iti tatrāpyanivārito viṣkambhaka-praveśaḥ |...prastāvanāṅka-madhyavartitāpyuktaiva |* Cf. Bhā-pra. p. 234. II. 11-15.
- 19 DR. III. 28-30 ; ND. p. 34 ; SD. VI. 62.
- 20 NS. Eng. Tra. Vol. I. p. 397. f.n. on XXI. 107.
- 20a Śr. pra. Vol. II. p. 463.
- 21 NS. GOS. Vol. II. p. 433. *prakaraṇe nāyakāpekṣayā prāyaśaḥ upayogino'pi madhyamā eva sambhavantīti tatra viṣkambhakasya bāhulyena sambhāvanam iti.....|*
- 22 NLRK. II. 362-363. Cārāyaṇa, as an authority on the Kāmaśāstra has been twice referred to in the Kāma-sūtra, I. I. 12 and I. 5. 22.
- 22a NLRK. II. 2789-2790.
- 23 Supra, definition of Viṣkambhaka.
- 24 NS. GOS. XVIII. 33 (KSS. XX. 32, KM. XVIII. 35) Abhinava (Vol. II. p. 424) says : *anyatra rūpake parimita-kāryopadeśāt na tathā praveśakopayoga iti.....|*
- 25 ND. p. 35.
- 26 We cannot accept the observation of Dr S. N. Shastri (LPSD. p. 66) that the above statement of the ND. "does not amount to an established principle of dramaturgy, nor has it any support in Bharata's canons", for the reasons stated above.

III. Aṅkāvatāra (Garbhāṅka)

- 1 NLRK. I. 397.
- 2 NLRK. II. 398-399.
- 3 Bhā-pra. (p. 218. II. 16-17) reads : *samāpyamāna ekasmin-nitarāṅkasya...* and *nātyajñaiḥ* in place *nātyoktaiḥ* of the NLRK. in the second half.
- 4 Mā. mā. p. 369. reading differs from that of the NLRK. in.. *ekasminnaṅke'nyasyaca...*, the second half is found as in the Bhā-pra.
- 5 NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 62. Bahurūpa in his Rūpadīpikā reads the verse : *samāpyamānam ekasminnaṅke'nyārthatva-sūcanam/samāpyati hi nātyajñair aṅkāvatāra iṣyate ||* (on DR. I. 62) (Taken from Garbhāṅka : its genesis and development by Dr K. K. Datta Shastri, OH. Vol. VII. pt. I. p. 48). Śdt. (Bhā-pra. p. 287. II. 7-9) speaks of two recensions of the NŚ. consisting of 12000 and 6000 verses respectively. The present NŚ. however, consists near-about 5000 verses.
- 6 NLRK. II. 400-406.
- 7 Mā. mā. p.369. At the end of the Act VIII Makaranda says : *astyetat, kintu bhagavatī-pādamūla-gamanamapyā-śaṅkate*. Jagaddhara comments : *tadiha bhagavatī-pāda-mūleti sādharmaṇa-pādollekhena mālatyā bhaviṣyat saudāmini-pārśva-gamanasya sūcanena navamāṅkāvatāro'pi sūcitaiḥ |* Then the above definition is quoted. In the same work (p. 79) Jagaddhara quotes another definition of the same.
- 8 SD. VI. 58-59. *aṅkānte sūcitaiḥ pātraistad aṅkasyāvibhā-gataḥ || yatrāṅko'vataratyēṣo'aṅkāvatāra iti smṛtaiḥ |* After this Viśvanātha remarks : *yathā-abhiñjāne pañcamāṅke pātraiḥ sūcitaiḥ ṣaṣṭhāṅkastad aṅkasyāṅga-viśeṣa ivāvatīrṇaiḥ |*
- 9 The Vikram, Kalidas special number, 1960. The fisher-man episode in the Abhi-śaku. pp. 51, 63.
- 10 DR. I. 62. *aṅkāvatārastvaṅkānte pāto'aṅkasyāvibhāgataḥ |* Dhanika specifically says : *praveśaka-viṣkambhakādi-śūnyam |*

- 11 DR. (Avaloka), p. 33.
- 12 Bhā-pra. p. 218. ll. 13, 18-20, 22.
- 13 SD. VI. 58-59.
- 14 PRYB. p. 116.
- 15 RS. III. 191-192. *an̄kāvatāraḥ pātrāṇām pūrvakāryānuvartinām | avibhāgena sarveṣāṃ bhāvinyāṅke praveśanam ||*
- 16 NC. p. 58. The second foot is read : *pūrvāṅkārtānuvartinām |*
- 17 NS̄. GOS. XIX. 115 ; KSS. XXI. 115, KM. XIX. 115.
- 18 NS̄. GOS. Vol. II. p. 421. *yathoktam : an̄kāntara evāṅko nipatati yasmin prayogam āsādyā|nātyārtha-kathā-yogād vijñeyo'ṅkāvatāro'sau |* Here the word *an̄kāntare* is misleading, the use of the seventh case-ending may be taken to signify in an *an̄ka*. But the introductory sentence *kathayaiva'* etc., as given below, and also the reading of the NS̄. (given above) suggest that the word *antara* here signifies proximity. The whole word may also be grammatically explained as *anyaḥ an̄kaḥ an̄kāntaram* and then the *adhikaraṇa* is to be taken as *aupaśleṣika* like *vaṭe gāvaḥ suśerate*. Cf. also the view of the ND. below.
- 19 NS̄. GOS. Vol. II. p. 421. *kathayaiva paraspara-śliṣṭayā-nubaddho'ṅkāvatāraḥ |*
- 20 ND. I. 27. p. 36. *so'ṅkāvatāro yat pātrairaṅkāntaram asūcanam |* In the gloss it is said : *avicchinārthatayā sūcanīyārthasyābhāvāt | praveśaka-viṣkambhaka-sūcanarahitam an̄kāntaram bhavati |*
- 21 NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 62.
- 22 NS̄. GOS. Vol. II. p. 417. Here also the use of the seventh case-ending creates confusion, but the word *yogaḥ* supports our interpretation.
- 23 NS̄. GOS. Vol. II. p. 417. *yatra tvaṅke sarveṣāṃ an̄kānām yo'artho bijalakṣaṇastasya saṃhāraḥ sammilitatvena prāptir bhavati 'so'vatārāṅkaḥ |* This is a part of Abhinava's gloss on *yatrārthasya* etc., of the NS̄. (GOS.) XVIII. 16. The full verse has been quoted before. Abhinava does not accept the traditional interpretation of the verse as

describing an Aṅka. (Cf. supra. Chap. VIII, Aṅka). In his opinion it describes three types of Aṅkas, as according to the view of Kohala. The above illustration has also been cited in the Bhā-pra. p. 219, ll. 1-2.

- 24 Śr. pra. (Vol. II), pp. 462-463.
- 25 Cf. supra, f.n. 18.
- 26 Śr. pra. (Vol. II) p. 471. *garbhāṅka-cūlikā-ṅkāvatāra-
viṣkambhaka-praveśaka-vidhānam...*
- 27 Śr. pra. (Vol. II) p. 477.
- 28 Supra, second view of Abhinava.
- 29 Bhā-pra. p. 219, l. 9.
- 30 ND. I. 27, p. 36.
- 31 ND. p. 36. *anye tu yatrāṅke anyāṅkānām bijalakṣaṇo'artho'-
avatāryate tam aṅkāvatāram āmananti|yathā ratnāvalyām...*
- 32 ND. pp. 36-37.
- 33 OH. Vol. VII. pt. I. Garbhāṅka. p. 50.
- 34 SD. VI. 20 and below.
- 35 Bāl. rā. Ed. Jivananda. Calcutta 1884.
- 36 RS. III. 206-211.
- 37 NC. p. 60.
- 38 For fuller treatment of the topic vide Dr K. K. Datta Shastri's article "Garbhāṅka : Its genesis and development in Sanskrit" in the OH. Vol. VII. pt. I. pp. 37-58.

IV. Aṅka-mukha (Aṅkāśya)

- 1 NLRK. I. 408. *sūtraṇaṃ sakalāṅkānām jñeyam aṅka-mukham
budhair iti|*
- 2 NLRK. II. 410-412.
- 3 Bhā-pra. p. 218, ll. 7-10.
- 4 NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 62.
- 5 NS. GOS. XIX. 116. *viśliṣṭa-mukham aṅkasya striyā vā
puruṣeṇa vā|yad upakṣipyate pūrvam tad-aṅka-mukham
iṣyate||* Abhinava (Vol. II. p. 417) ascribes the verse to Kohala.
- 6 DR. I. 62. *aṅkānta-pātrair aṅkāśyam chinnāṅkasyārtha-*

sūcanāt | Avaloka (p. 32) *aṅkānta eva pātram aṅkānta-pātram* | *tena viśliṣṭasyottarāṅka-mukhasya sūcanam tadvaśenottarā-
ṅkāvatāro'ṅkāsyam iti* | ND. I. 26, p. 35 ; RS. III. 188-189.

- 7 Śr. pra. Vol. II. p. 463, Śr. pra. (Vol. II. p. 477) gives the same illustration as NLRK.
- 8 Bhā-pra. 214. I. 22.
- 9 Bhā-pra. p. 218. II. 1-2.
- 10 Bhā-pra. p. 218. II. 7-10.
- 11 Bhā-pra. p. 217. II. 21-22, p. 218. II. 11-12.
- 12 SD. VI. 59-60. *yatra syād aṅke ekasminnāṅkānām sūcanā-khilā* | *tad aṅkamukham ityāhur bijārtha-khyāpakam ca yat* || *yathā mālatīmādhave* etc.
- 13 SD. VI. 60 and below, pp. 349-350. It is interesting to note that Viśvanātha here seems to identify Dhanañjaya and Dhanika.
- 14 SD. below VI. 60. p. 350. *anye tu aṅkāvatāreṇaivedam gatārtham ityāhuḥ* |
- 15 NC. p. 1.
- 16 NC. p. 58.

V. Cūlikā

- 1 NLRK. II. 412-413. *cūlikā saṃjñā-śabdo'yaṃ nepathya-sthānasthitānām* (Dr Raghavan's enendation accepted. NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 72) (The text reads *nepathye*) *kārya-vaśād-vihitānām ālapanam* |
- 2 NLRK. II. 414-415. The second quarter of the verse is found in the Bhā-pra. (p. 217. I. 18). Bhoja (Śr. pra. Vol. II. p. 463) also read *māgadha-sūtādibhiḥ*.
- 3 DR. I. 62 ; Avaloka p. 32 ; ND. I. 26, p. 35, SD. VI. 58 ; NC. p. 58. These texts maintain that Cūlikā is the *sūcana* (indication) of the *artha*. But Sāgara by *arthopa-kṣepaṇa* means *arthaprakāśana* (I. 417).
- 4 NLRK. I. 416-417.
- 4a Journal of the University of Gauhati, Vol. III. p. 18.

- 4b Cf. Bhā-pra. p. 294. l 6. Here in a list of *sadasyas* Śdt. mentions one *nāndi-maṅgala-pāṭhaka*.
- 5 NLRK. I. 426. The illustrations of Cūlikā, performed by Sūta and Vandin are cited from the third Acts of the V. sam. and Mu. rā. (ll. 418-425) and of those where leading characters take part are cited from the Act VI of the V. sam. and Act. I of the *Jānaki-rāghava* where Bhīma and Rāvaṇa respectively, do the job of *artha-prakāśana*. This contention of Sāgara that even major characters take part in Cūlikā is supported by a reading found in the KSS. edition of the NŚ. (XXI, III). Here the second quarter of the verse is read as : *uttamādhama-madhyamaiḥ*.
- 6 NLRK. II. 437-439. The GOS. ed. of the NŚ. defines Cūlikā as : *antaryavanikāsaṁsthaiḥ sūtādibhir anekadhā | arthopakṣepaṇam yattu kriyate sā hi cūlikā ||* Abhinava's commentary on this verse is not available. Sāgara's *yatha pati* ..., as given above, is not from the Nāṭya-śāstra. None of the above two definitions (ascribe to Bharata and Aśmakutṭa) also is exactly similar to that of the NŚ.⁶
- 7 NŚ. GOS. Vol. II. p. 417.
- 8 ND. p. 35.
- 9 RS. III. 182-188.
- 10 NC. p. 58.
- 11 RS. III. 187.
- 12 RS. p. 281-282.

VI. A general review of the Arthopakṣepakas

- 1 NŚ. GOS. XIX. 110-116 ; KM. XIX. 108-116 ; KSS. XXI. 108-116.
- 2 NŚ. GOS. Vol. III. p. 64 ; Dr Raghavan also maintains (NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 62, note on l. 437) that these verses of the NŚ. are later additions from Kohala or some post-Bharata writer.
- 3 OH. Vol. VII. pt. I. pp. 41-45. Garbhāṅka.

- 4 OH. Vol. VII. pt. I. p. 41.
- 5 NŚ. GOS. XXXVII. 18. *śeṣam uttaratantreṇa kohalaḥ kathayiṣyati |*
- 6 Mm. P. V. Kane. HSP. p. 24.
- 7 Mm. P. V. Kane. HSP. p. 24.
- 7a Cf. Aṅkāvatāra, supra, f.n. 18, and the definition quoted above that.
- 8 NŚ. GOS. Vol. II. p. 421.
- 9 NŚ. GOS. Vol. II. pp. 421, 422, 427.
- 10 Dr K. K. Datta Shastri, Garbhāṅka ; OH. Vol. VII. pt. I. p. 46. It may be noted that the Garbhāṅka itself is a scene in an Act but came to be recognised later, as shown before.
- 11 Rucipati (An. rā. p. 77) takes Cūlikā as a decorative device ; *ayam eva cūdikā nāmāṅkārah.*
- 12 Cf. U. ca. Act II. The Act begins with a Cūlikā.
- 13 NŚ. GOS. Vol. II. pp. 416-417. *tathā coktaṃ kohalādaḥ (Kohalena ?)*

*tridhāṅko 'ṅkāvatāreṇa cūdayāṅka-mukheṇa vā |
arthopakṣepaṇaṃ cūḍā bahvarthaiḥ sūta-vaṇḍibhiḥ ||
aṅkasyāṅkāntare yagastvavatārah prakīrtitaḥ |
viśliṣṭa-mukham aṅkasya striyā vā puruṣeṇa vā ||
yadupakṣipyate pūrvam tadaṅka-mukham iṣyate |*

- 14 Cf. f.n. 8 supra.
- 15 NLRK. I. 396.
- 16 NLRK. I. 306.
- 17 NLRK. I. 364.
- 18 Abhi-śaku. p. 188. *kvacit pustake tṛtīyaḥ praveśakaḥ iti pāṭhaḥ | tatra viṣkambhadvayaṃ tṛtīya-catūrtthayor-aṅkayoḥ saṣṭhe tṛtīyaḥ praveśakaḥ ityarthah |*
- 19 Abhi-śaku. p. 70.
- 20 DSL. p. 54.
- 21 NLRK. I. 307 (explained before).
- 22 DSL. p. 55.
- 23 DSL. p. 54.

- 24 DR. I. 56-58 ; Bhā-pra. p. 214. ll. 15-22 ; ND. I. 23 ; SD. VI. 51-52.

Chapter X

- 1 NS. GOS. IV. 2-3, 10 The NS. altogether refers to three dramatic representations. The title of the first one is not given, it is referred to (I. 57) as, *yathā daityāḥ surairjitāḥ*. Abhinava (Vol. I. p. 26) says of it, *dimasama-vakārehāmṛgādīnām anyatamaḥ prayogaḥ* |
- 2 Mahā-bhāṣya on Pāṇini's III. I. 26. *pratyakṣaṃ kṣamaṃ ghātayanti pratyakṣaṃ balim bandhayanti.....* |
- 3 NLRK. ll. 383-387. *pradhāna-vastu-nirdeśād bhavati hi nāṭakādīnām nāmeti | pradhānasya nirdeśād vastu-nirdeśād vā nāṭakādīnām nāma kartavyam | yathā jānakī-rāghavam nāma nāṭakam | rāmānandam | vastu-nirdeśāt kunda-mālā nāma nāṭakam | prakaraṇam api mālātī-mādhavam nāma | vastu-nirdeśān mṛcchakaṭikā nāma prakaraṇam* | It may be noted that the title *Rāmānanda* neither refers purely to the *pradhāna* nor indicates the theme only. Here the name of the *pradhāna* is associated with an indication to the plot.
- 4 Bhā-pra. p. 300. l. 3. *nāyakādi* seems to be the intended reading as the title *Rāmābhyudaya* has been cited (l. 4) for illustration which contains both the name of the hero and the chief motif of the theme.
- 5 Al. Sa. IX. 30-31.
- 6 SD. VI. 142-143.
- 7 An. rā. p. 15.
- 8 Abhi-śaku. p. 163.

(ii) Title of the Aṅka

- 1 NLRK. 387-388.
- 2 Vidyānātha also gives names to the Acts of his *udāharana-nāṭaka* PRYB.
- 3 Bhā-pra. — NLRK.

- Gaurīgrha (Act I of Nāgā) p. 219. l. 1 — l. 400
 Citraśālāṅka (?) p. 250. l. 16 — ll. 2818-2819
 Puṁsavanāṅka (from Chalitārāma) p. 250. l. 20 —
 ll. 2820-2821
 Kulapatyaṅka (Act II of Udātta-rāghava) p. 279. l. 10 —
 ll. 3111-3112
 Names of two other Acts, Aśvatthāmāṅka (Act III of V. sam) and Caitrāvalī (Act I of R.V.) referred to in the Bhā-pra. (pp. 217, 237. ll. 17, 15) are also found in the NLRK. in different contexts than the former.
 SD. (with Lakṣmī ṭikā) — NLRK
 Aśvatthāmāṅka, pp. 348, 372-373 — ll. 321, 728-729, 739 respectively
 Gr̥havr̥kṣavāṭikā (Act I of Puṣpadūṣitaka) p. 419 —
 ll. 1714-1715
 Kumbhāṅka (Act V of Udātta-rāghava) p. 421 — l. 1806
 Vibhīṣaṇa-nirbhartsanāṅka, p. 421 — l. 1810
 Anutāpāṅka (Act ? of Chalitārāma) p. 422 — l. 1825
 Sundarāṅka (Act IV of V. Sam) p. 425 — ll. 1798-1799
 (For identification of Acts referred to in the NLRK. Cf. Dr Raghavan's notes, NLRK. Eng. Tra. p. 71).
 4 Dr G. Sastri. CHCSL. p. 97. —
 5 Dr S. N. Dasgupta. HSL. p. 717 ; Sukthankar. JBRAS. 1925. p. 141. KR. Pisharoti, Nāndī—A note, BSOS. Vol. VI. 1930-32. pp. 819-20.
 6 Mā. mā (with the Com. of Jagaddhara) p. 81.
 7 Bhā-pra. p. 287. ll. 7-9 ; for the problem of Ādi-bharata see the Paper on the topic by Dr S. K. De, Our Heritage. Vol. I. Pt. II.
 8 NS. GOS. Vol. I (Second edition), p. 59.
 9 Supra. Bija (pp. 45-47). Nirvahaṇa-sandhi (p. 118) ; Praveśaka (p. 240) ; Viṣkambhaka (p. 253).

Chapter XI

- 1 Mahā-bhāṣya as quoted in the *Siddhānta-kaumudī*.

- 2 LPSD. p. 319.
- 3 Skt. Dr. p. 326.
- 4 NLRK. II. 1045, 1052.
- 5 Abhi-bhā. Vol. III. p. 88. *tena pañca vṛttayo dve vṛtti ityādayo'samvidita-bharatābhiprāya-pañcita-sahṛdayammanya-parikalpitasadbhāvāḥ pravādā nirastā bhavanti* | Vol I. p. 269. *dve tisraḥ pañceti nirākaraṇāya catsra ityuktam* |
- 6 JOR. Vol. II. pt. 2. p. 91.
- 7 Abhi-bhā. Vol. II. p. 451.
- 8 LPSD. p. 325.
- 9 DR. II. 60-61. and also the *Avaloka* on the verse.
- 10 Bhā-pra. p. 12. l. 6.
- 11 & 12 Abhi-bhā. Vol. II. p. 451. The portion *tasmāt..... rūpa* (in 12) in the text is read as : *tasmāc-ceṣṭātmikā nyāya-vṛttir-anyāya-vṛttir-vāgrūpā*. This is evidently corrupt. The reading offered by Dr Raghavan (JOR. Vol. VII. pt. 2. p. 42) from Madras manuscript as : *tasmāc-ceṣṭātmikā nyāya-vṛttir-anyāya-vṛttir-vā*, does not appear satisfactory as it omits *vāk*.
- 13 Abhi-bhā. Vol. II. p. 452.
- 14 Abhi-bhā. Vol. II. pp. 451-2. *phala-vṛttau ca vṛtti-sāmānya-lakṣaṇam vyāpāra-rūpatvam yadi nāsti tat katham vṛttitvam.....| yatkiñcid iha nāṭye samasti taced vṛttiṣvantarbhāvyam tadā bhaved etat| na caivam| raṅgo hi nāma kā vṛttiḥ| na hi kimcid vyāpāra-śūnyam varṇanīyam asti| mada-mūrchadī-varṇanāyām api mano-vyāpārasya.. sambhāvāt| na hi sarvaṃ nāṭyam vṛtti-brahmatayā samarthanīyam...|*
- 15 Śr-pra. Vol. II. p. 485. *nāyakopanāyakādinām mano-vāk-kāya-krama-nibandhanāḥ pañca vṛttayo bhavanti| bhārati... vimiśrā ceti|*
- 16 NLRK. II. 1048-49.

II. Characteristics of Different Vṛtti-s

- 1 LPSD. Chap. VII.
- 2 NLRK. I. 1068.

A. Bhārati

- 3 NS. (GOS). XX. 26 ; NLRK. I. 1054-57.
- 4 Cf. NS. GOS. XX. 32 and 39, *lakṣaṇam pūrvam uktam tu vīthyāḥ prahasanasya ca* |
- 5 NS. GOS. XX. 28 ; NLRK. II. 1070-71.
- 6 NS. GOS. V. 59, *upakṣepeṇa kāvyasya hetu-yukti-samāśrayā/ siddhenāmantranam yā tu vijñeyā sā prarocanā* || Cf. also V. 135.
- 7 NS. GOS. XX. 29, see fn. thereon.
- 8 NLRK. I. 1073.
- 9 NLRK. II. 1080-86.
- 10 NLRK. II. 1087-91.
- 11 DR. III. 6 ; Bhā-pra. p. 197 ; ND. p. 138 ; SD. VI. 30.
- 12 NS. GOS. XX. 31 ; NLRK. I. 176.
- 13 Abhi-bhā. Vol. I. pp. 249-50.
- 14 OH. Vol. V. pt. I and Vol. IX. pt. I.

B. Sāttvatī

- 1 NLRK. II. 1234-38 ; NS. GOS. XX. 41. *yā sāttvateneha guṇena yuktā nyāyena vṛttena samanvitā ca/ harṣotkaṭā saṃhṛta-śoka-bhāvā sā sāttvatī nāma bhavettu vṛttiḥ* || The second foot in the NLRK. reads : *tyāgena śauryeṇa.....* and in the third foot, *harṣottarā* instead of *harṣotkaṭā* of the NS. Sāgara's reading is supported by those of mss. of the NS. Cf. f.n. 10, 12 below the above.
- 2 Abhi-bhā. Vol. III. p. 96.
- 3 NS. GOS. XX. 42.
- 4 ND. p. 139.
- 5 NLRK. I. 1273 ; NS. GOS. XX. 43.
- 6 NS. XX. 44, reads Sallāpa.
- 7 NLRK. II. 1276-78. *utthāsyāmyam aham tvam (tāvat) darśayāt-manah śaktim / arere praharasva paśyāmate śaktim ityādi / saṃgharṣāśrāyad vāpi prājñair-utthāpako mataḥ* | The first line is from the NS. (XX. 45) where it reads :

aham-apyutthāsyāmi tvam etc. The second one may be taken as an illustration. The third line is similar to the second half of the above verse of the NS. where the reading is ; *iti saṃgharṣa-samutthas-tajjñair.....* |

- 8 DR. II. 54 ; RS. I. 265 ; SD. VI. 130.
- 9 NLRK. II. 1279-82 and 1285-86.
- 10 NS. GOS. XX. 46.
- 11 DR. II. 55 ; RS. I. 267 ; SD. VI. 132.
- 12 NLRK. I. 1288 ; NS. GOS. XX. 48.
- 13 DR. II. 54 ; RS. I. 264-65 ; SD. VI. 132.
- 14 NS. GOS. XX. 50 ; NLRK. II. 1298-99 ; DR. II. 55 ; SD. VI. 131 ; RS. I. 266.
- 15 NLRK. II. 1300-02.
- 16 ND. p. 139. *idaṃ ca mānasam karma vicitrābhīr-gambhīro-ktibhiḥ prārabdha-kāryā-parityāgāt kāryāntara-parigraheṇa saṃgrāmāya parotsāheṇa sāmādi-prayoga-daivādinā ari-saṃghāta-bheda-jananenānyaiśca bahubhiḥ prakārair-lakṣyata iti* |

C. Kaiśikī

- 1 NS. GOS. XX. 53.
- 2 NS. GOS. XX. 54-55.
- 3 SD. VI. 124.
- 4 NLRK. II. 1304-07.
- 5 NLRK. I. 672.
- 6 NLRK. II. 1310-11.
- 7 NLRK. I. 1312. *upasthāpita-śṛṅgāraṃ hāsyapracāna-prāyaṃ narma varṇayantyācāryaḥ* |
- 8 NS. GOS. XX. 57-58.
- 9 Abhi-bhā. Vol. III. 100-101.
- 10 NLRK. II. 1327-30.
- 11 NLRK. II. 2828-32.
- 12 NLRK. II. 1331-32.
- 13 NLRK. II. 1334-35.
- 14 DR. II. 48-50 ; RS. I. 270-76 ; SD. VI. 125-26 ; NC. pp. 68-69.

- 15 NLRK. II. 1336-38. The situation referred to may be from the third act of the *Mālavikāgnimitram*.
- 16 NS. GOS. XX. 60 and Abhi-bhā. thereon.
- 17 DR. II. 51.
- 18 RS. I. 277-78.
- 19 SD. VI. 127 ; NC. p. 69.
- 20 Abhi-śaku. with Ra-ca. p. 225. *nāyikāyāśca netuśca yade-
kante parasparam | sambhogānumataṃ vākyaṃ narma-
sphoṭaḥ sa ucyate ||*
- 21 Mā-mā. p. 273. *narmasphoṭastu bhāvānām dehasthānām
prakāśanam |*
- 22 NLRK. II. 1338-40.
- 23 NS. GOS. XX. 61. *vijñānarūpaśobhādhanādibhir nāyako
guṇair yatra | pracchannaṃ vyavaharate kāryavaśān-narma-
garbho'sau ||*
- 24 DR. II. 52.
- 25 SD. VI. 127.
- 26 Mā-mā. p. 290. *kārya-kāraṇato yatra nāyako gopayet
tanum | narmagarbhaḥ sa kathito.....||*
- 27 RS. I. 279.
- 28 NS. GOS. XX. 62. *pūrvasthitau vipadyeta nāyako yatra
cāparas-tiṣṭhet | tamapīha narmagarbhaṃ vidyān nāṭya-
poryogeṣu ||*
- 29 RS. I. 279-80. *pūrvasthito vipadyeta nāyako yatra vā
parastiṣṭhet tamapīha narmagarbhaṃ pravadati bharato hi
nāṭyaveda-guruḥ ||*
- 30 NLRK. II. 1342-43. *navasaṅgama-sambhogo yatra jāyeta
subhruvaḥ | narmasphañjo hyasau jñeyastvavasāna-bhayā-
nakaḥ ||* NS. GOS. XX. 59.
- 31 NLRK. II. 1344-45.
- 32 Abhi-bhā. Vol. III. p. 100.
- 33 DR. II. 51 ; SD. VI. 127.

D. Ārabhaṭi

- 2 NS. (GOS) XX. 65. There is a third one (66) which according to the editor interpolated.
- 3 NLRK. II. 1348-49.
- 4 NLRK. I. 1350.
- 5 NS. GOS. XX. 68.
- 6 NLRK. II. 1358-59.
- 7 LPSD. p. 323.
- 8 NLRK. Eng. tra. p. 31.
- 9 Dr M. Ghosh. NS. p. 409.
- 10 Abhi-bhā. Vol. III. p. 103.
- 11 See "Pusta in Sanskrit Drama and Dramaturgy" (OH. Vol. IX. pt. 11) of the present writer.
- 12 NLRK. II. 1364-67.
- 13 DR. II. 57-58 and Avaloka thereon.
- 14 SD. VI. 135-36.
- 15 ND. p. 140-41.
- 16 NLRK. I. 1371 and II. 1368-69.
- 17 NS. GOS. XX. 69.
- 18 DR. II. 59 ; SD. VI. 136 ; RS. I. 284.
- 19 NLRK. II. 1372-79.
- 20 NS. GOS. XX. 70.
- 21 DR. II. 59 ; SD. VI. 136 ; RS. I. 284.
- 22 NLRK. II. 1380-84 ; NS. GOS. XX. 71.
- 23 DR. II. 58 ; RS. I. 285 ; SD. VI. 135.
- 24 NLRK. I. 1380, *vīra-raudrādbhuta prāyair-yuktaḥ* |

III. Vṛtti and Rasa

- 1 NS. GOS. XX. 73-74 and footnotes thereon.
- 2 NLRK. II. 1358-62.
- 3 NLRK. II. 1063-67.
- 4 Abhi-bhā. Vol. III. p. 105.
- 5 Abhi-bhā. Vol. III. p. 452.
- 6 HSP. p. 24.
- 7 JOR. Vol. VII. Pt. 2. pp. 45-46.
- 8 DR. II. 62 ; SD. VI. 122.

- 9 RS. p. 87.
- 10 ND. p. 130.
- 10a RS. p. 87.
- 11 Abhi-bhā. Vol. III. p. 105. *atra sama-śabdaḥ (śabdena?) śānta-rasa-parigraha itī tadvādinō manyanta | samāśretyānye paṭhanti |*
- 12 NLRK. I. 1272.
- 13 NŚ. KM. XX. 39 ; NŚ. (Eng. tra.) Dr M. M. Ghosh XXI. 40.
- 14 NLRK. II. 1258-63 ; cf. Abhi-bhā. Vol. I. p. 273 where the first verse is quoted.
- 15 NŚ. XX. 43 and Abhi-bhā. which runs as : *śṛṅgāre viṣaya-nimagnam manaḥ.....na sātīṣayam parisphurātīti .. |*
- 15a RS. p. 83.
- 16 Abhi-bhā, Vol. II. 452. *karuṇa-pradhānā bhārati-vṛttiḥ paridevita-bāhulyāt | ... yattu śṛṅgāra itī kohalenoktaṃ tan-muni-matavirodhā upekṣyam eva |*
- 17 NŚ. GOS. VI. 39.
- 18 NLRK. II. 1972-73. *raudra-bībhatsa-bhayānakāḥ bhāratyā-rabhaṭi-viṣayāḥ ... |*
- 19 DR. II. 62 ; SD. VI. 122.
- 20 RS. p. 87.
- 21 NŚ. GOS. Vol. II. Introduction p. XX.

IV. Vṛtti and Rīti

- 1 NLRK. II. 1232-33, 1302, 1346, 1385 respectively ; cf. also II. 1971-74.
- 2 NLRK. II. 1389-90.
- 3 NLRK. II. 1971-74.

V. Nature and Mutual Relation of the Vṛtti-s

- 1 NLRK. I. 1386 ; NŚ. GOS. XVIII. 4.
sarveṣāmeva kāvyānām (nāṭyānām) mātṛkā vṛttayaḥ smṛtāḥ | ābhyo vinīṣitaṃ hyetaddaśarūpaṃ prayogataḥ ||

- 1a NLRK. II. 1046-47.
- 2 Sañ-dā, p. 73.
- 3 NLRK. I. 1046 ; *Kāvya-mīmāṃsā* (GOS), 3rd. ed. p. 9.
- 4 Śr-pra. Vol. II. p. 486.
- 5 Abhi-bhā. Vol. III. p. 83.
- 6 ND. p. 135.
- 7 DR. p. 57.
- 8 SD. p. 392.
- 9 NLRK. I. 1048.
- 10 NLRK. I. 1050.
- 11 Abhi-bhā. Vol. III. p. 91.
- 12 ND. p. 135. *catasra iti caturbhedaṭvām anyatama-ceṣṭāṇṣa-prādhānya vivakṣayā, aparathāneka-vyāpāra-samvalitam ekam eva vṛtti-tattvam |*
- 13 DR. p. 61.
- 14 SR. p. 71.
- 15 DR. III. 2, 4.

*pūrvaraṅgam vidhāyādau sūtradhāre vinirgate |
 praviśya tadvadaparaḥ kāvyam āsthāpayen naṭaḥ ||
 raṅgam prasādyā madhuraiḥ ślokaḥ kāvyārthasūcakaiḥ |
 ṛtuṃ kañcit samādāya bhāratim vṛttim āśrayet ||*

It is interesting to note that Jagaddhara attributes the second verse to Bharata (Mā-mā. p. 6) and Rāghava-bhaṭṭa to Dhanika (Abhi-śaku. p. 8).

- 16 NS. GOS. XX. 28.
- 17 NS. GOS. XX. 31.
- 18 NS. GOS. XVIII. 107. *vithyaṅgaiḥ samyuktaṃ kartavyaṃ prahasanaṃ yathā yogam |*
- 19 Abhi-śaku. 13 ; NLRK. II. 1185-86 ; DR. III. 9.
- 20 NLRK. I. 1228.
- 21 JOR. Vol. VI. Pt. IV.
- 22 Abhi-bhā. Vol. III. p. 91.
- 23 Abhi-bhā. Vol. III. p. 91.
- 24 ND. p. 36. *prarocanāmukhayor anyatrāpi ca rūpakaikadeśe prākṛtādipāṭhena bhāratī-darśanāt prāyo-grahaṇam arthavat | sarva-rūpakabhāvitvāt rasānām ca vāgjanyatvāt sarvarasātmakatva |*

BOOKS AND JOURNALS ETC. CONSULTED

I. Ancient Texts and Commentaries

- Abhidhāna-cintāmaṇi of Hemacandra—Ed. Bothlingk & Riew, 1847.
- Abhijñāna-śakuntalam of Kālidāsa—(With Rāghava-bhaṭṭa's commentary Arthadyotanikā) Ed. N. B. Godbole, tenth edition, Bombay, 1933. (With the commentary of Abhirāma) Śrī Vāṇivilās Sanskrit Series, 13, Srirangam, Ed. J. K. Balasubrahmanyam. (With the commentaries Rasacandrikā and Ṭippanī of Śaṅkara and Narahari) Ed. Ramanatha Jha, Mithila Institute of P. G. Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning, Darbhanga.
- Agni-purāṇā (with Bengali Translation) Bangabashi, Calcutta.
- Alaṅkāra-saṃgraha of Amṛtānanda-yogin, Ed. V. Krishnamacariya.
- Anargha-rāghava of Murāri (With the commentary of Rucipati) Ed. Durgaprasada and K. P. Paraba, NSP., 1887.
- Avi-māraka of Bhāsa (Bhāsanāṭakacakra) Ed. C. R. Devadhar (2nd ed.), Poona, 1951.
- Abhiṣeka of Bhāsa (Bhāsanāṭakacakra) Ed. C. R. Devadhar (2nd ed.), Poona, 1951.
- Āścarya-cūḍāmaṇi of Śaktibhadra—Ed. Bāla-manoramā Series, IX, Madras, 1926.
- Bāla-carita of Bhāsa. Ed. C. R. Devadhar, 1951.
- Bāla-Bhārata (Pracaṇḍa-pāṇḍava) of Rājaśekhara, Ed. Kāvya-mālā, 17, Bombay 1889.
- Bāla-rāmāyaṇa of Rājaśekhara—Jivananda Vidyasagara, Calcutta, 1884.
- Bhagavadajjukīyam of Bodhāyana Kavi—Ed. P. Anujan Achan, Trichur, 1925.
- Bhāvaprakāśana of Śārādātanaya—GOS., XLV, 1930.
- Brhat-kathā-maṇjarī of Kṣemendra—Ed. Kāvya-mālā, 69, Bombay, 1901.

- Candrakalā of Viśvanātha, Ed. S. N. Rajguru and Sarvesavar Das, Bhubaneswar, 1958.
- Caturbhāṇi, Ed. M. R. Kavi & S. K. Ramanatha Sastri, Sivapuri, 1922.
- Cārudatta of Bhāsa, Ed. C. R. Devadhar, 1951.
- Daśarūpaka of Dhanañjaya (with Avaloka of Dhanika)—Ed. K. P. Parab, Fifth Edition, NSP., 1941 ; Ed. C. Haas New York, 1922 ; Ed. Dr Bholasankara Vyasa, Chowkhamba, 1962.
- Dūta-ghaṭotkaca of Bhāsa—Ed. T. Ganapati Sastri, TSS., XXII, 1912.
- Dūtavākya of Bhāsa—Ed. T. Ganapati Sastri, TSS., XXII, 1912.
- Dūtāṅgada of Subhaṭa—Ed. Durgaprasad & K. P. Parab, Kāvya-mālā 28, Bombay, 1891.
- Dhvanyāloka of Ānandavardhana (with Locana)—Ed. Acarya Jagannatha Pathaka, 1965 ; Ed. NSP., Bombay, 1911.
- Hari-vamśa, Ed. Pratapcandra Roy, Calcutta.
- Kalyāṇa-saugandhikā of Nīlakaṇṭha, Ed. Lakṣmanasvarupa, Lahore.
- Karṇabhāra of Bhāsa Ed. C. R. Devadhar, 1951.
- Karpūra-mañjarī (with the commentary of Vāsudeva), Ed. NSP, 1927 ; Ed. Dr Manomohan Ghosh, C.U., 1939.
- Kāma-sūtra of Vātsyāyana, Ed. Pancanana Tarkaratna, Calcutta, 1334 (Bengali San).
- Kāvya-darśa of Daṇḍin, Ed. Jīvananda Vidyasagar, Calcutta, 1934.
- Kāvya-prakāśa of Mammaṭa, Ed. Ānandāśrama-Saṃskṛta granthāvali, No. 66, 1929.
- Kāvya-mīmāṃsā of Rājaśekhara—Ed. GOS. 1934.
- Kāvya-nuśāsana of Hemacandra—Ed. Kāvya-mālā, 71, 1901.
- Kundamālā of Dinnāga, Ed. Dr K. K. Dutta Sastri, Calcutta Sanskrit College Research Series XXVIII, 1964.
- Kuṭṭanīmata of Dāmodaragupta, Ed. Tridibnath Roy, Calcutta.
- Madhyama-vyāyoga of Bhāsa—Ed. C. R. Devadhar, 1951.
- Mahānāṭaka (Dāmodara's version, styled Hanuman-nāṭaka), Ed. Bapu Hara Sett, Develekar, 1863.

- Mahānāṭaka (Madhusūdana's version), Ed. Jivananda Vidya-sagar, Calcutta, 1939.
- Mahāvīracarita of Bhavabhūti, Ed. Anundoram Borooha, Calcutta, 1877.
- Mahābhāṣya, Ed. NSP. 1917.
- Mālatīmādhava of Bhavabhūti, Ed. Kunjabehari Tarkasid-dhanta, Calcutta 1919. (with the com. of Jagaddhara), Ed. R. G. Bhandarkar, 1905.
- Mālavikāgnimitra of Kālidāsa (with the commentary of Kāṭayavema), Ed. S. P. Pandit, Bombay, 1889.
- Mṛcchakaṭīka of Śūdraka (with the commentaries of Lalla Dikṣita & Prthivīdhara), Ed. N. B. Godbole, Bombay, 1896. Ed. V. R. Nerurkar, 1937 ; Ed. Mm. Haridas Siddhantavagish, 1922.
- Mudrārākṣasa (With the commentary of Dhunḍirāja), Ed. K. T. Telang, Bombay, 1893 ; Ed. K. H. Dhruva, 2nd Ed., Poona, 1923 ; Ed. R. R. Deshpande, (2nd Ed.), 1948.
- Nāgara-sarvasava of Padmaśrī (With Jagajjyoti-malla's commentary), Ed. Bombay, 1921.
- Nāgānanda of Śrīharṣa, Ed. Nabinchandra Vidyaratna, Calcutta, 1887. (With Abhirāma's commentary), Ed. T. Ganapati Sastri, TSS., LIX, 1917.
- Nāṭaka-candrikā of Rūpagosvāmin, Ed. Purīdāsa Mahāśaya, Maimansing, 1948.
- Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratnakōśa of Sāgaranandin, Ed. Myles Dillon, London, 1937.
- Nāṭya-darpaṇa of Rāmacandra-Guṇacandra Ed. GOS., XLVIII, 1959. (Revised Second Ed.).
- Nāṭya-śāstra of Bharata (With Abhinava-bhārati) ; Vol. I. GOS., XXXVI, 1956 (Second Ed.) ; Vol. II. GOS., LXVIII, 1934 ; Vol. III. GOS., CXXIV, 1954 ; Ed. Kashi Sanskrit Series, 60, 1929 ; Ed. Kāvya-mālā, Bombay, 1943.
- Pañca-rātra of Bhāsa, Ed. C. R. Devadhar, 1951.
- Pārtha-parākrama-vyāyoga of Prahlādāna, Ed. Chimanlal D. Dalal, GOS., 1917.

- Pārvati-pariṇaya of Bāna—Ed. M. R. Telang, Bombay, 1916.
- Prabodha-candrodaya of Kṛṣṇamīśra—Ed. Mahesh Pal, Calcutta, 1887.
- Pratāparudra-yaśobhūṣaṇa of Vidyānātha (With the commentary of Kumārasvāmin)—Ed. K. P. Trivedi, Bombay, 1909.
- Pratijñāyauḡandharāyaṇa of Bhāsa—Ed. C. R. Devadhar, 1951.
- Pratimā-nāṭaka of Bhāsa Ed.—C. R. Devadhar, 1951—Ed. S. M. Paranjape, Poona, 1930.
- Priyadarśikā of Śrīharṣa—Ed. Jivananda Vidyasagara, Calcutta, 1874.
- Rasārṇava-sudhākara of Śiṅgabhūpāla—Ed. T. Ganapati Sastri, TSS., 1916.
- Ratnāvali of Śrīharṣa—Ed. S. Roy, Calcutta, 1919.
- Rāja-taraṅgiṇi of Kahlāṇa—Ed. Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta, 1835. Ed. Calcutta Sanskrit Series, Calcutta, 1933.
- Rāmāyaṇa of Vālmiki (N. W. Recension)—Ed. Bhagavad Datta, Lahore, 1931.
- Sarasvatī-kaṇṭhābharāṇa of Bhoja—Ed. A. Barooah, Calcutta, 1883.
- Sāhitya-darpaṇa of Viśvanātha—(With Lakṣmīṭikā)—Ed. Kāśi Saṃskṛta granthamātā. 145 (Second edition) 1955.
- Śrīṅgāra-prakāśa of Bhoja (Vol. II)—Ed. G. R. Josyer, Mysore 1963.
- Samkalpa-sūryodaya of Veṅkaṭanātha Vedāntadeśika Kavī-tārkikasimha, Ed. K. Srinivasacharya, Conjeevaram, 1914.
- Saṅgīta Dāmodara of Śubhaṅkara—Ed. Dr. Gourinath Sastri and Dr. Govindagopal Mukhopadhyaya, Calcutta Sanskrit College Research Series No. XI, 1960.
- Svapna-vāsavadattā (Svapna-nāṭaka) of Bhāsa—Ed. C. R. Devadhar, 1951.
- Tāpasa-vatsarāja-carita of Anaṅgaharṣa—Ed. Jadugiri Jati-
raja, Bangalore, 1928.
- Tikā-sarvasva of Sarvānanda—Ed. T. Ganapati Sastri, TSS. 38, Trivandrum, 1938.
- Ūrubhaṅga of Bhāsa—Ed. C. R. Devadhar, 1951.

- Uttara-rāma-carita of Bhavabhūti (With Virarāghava's Commentary)—Ed. Narayana Rama Acarya, NSP. 1949; Ed. Gurunath Vidyanidhi, Calcutta, 1328 (Bengali San) ; Ed. S. K. Belvalkar, 1921.
- Vakrokti-jivita of Kuntaka—Ed. S. K. De, Calcutta, 1928.
- Viddha-sālabhañjikā of Rājaśekhara, Ed. B. R. Arte, Poona, 1886.
- Vikramorvaśiya of Kālidāsa (With Raṅganātha's commentary) Ed. K. P. Parab (Second edition) NSP., Bombay, 1897 (The Koṇeśvari Tikā only) Ed. H. D. Velankar, ABORI. Vol. 38, pts. 3-4, pp. 256-294.
- Viṣṇudharmottara-purāṇa—Ed. CXXX. 1958.
- Veṇī-saṃhāra of Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇa (With the commentary of Tārānātha Tarkavācaspati) Ed. Jivananda Vidyasagar, (5th edition) 1934. Ed. Tārānātha Tarkavācaspati, Calcutta, 1868.

Modern Books

- A Concise History of Classical Sanskrit Literature—Dr. Gaurinath Sastri, Calcutta, 1960.
- A History of Sanskrit Literature—A. B. Keith, 1941.
- A History of Sanskrit Literature, Vol. I. (classical period), Calcutta University, 1947.
- Aspects of Sanskrit Literature—Dr. S. K. De, Calcutta, 1959.
- Bāṅgālā Sāhityera Itihāsa—Dr. Sukumar Sen, 3rd. ed., Calcutta.
- Bāṅgālīra Itihāsa—Dr. Nihar Ranjan Roy, Calcutta.
- Bharata Kośa—M. R. Kavi, Tirupati, 1951.
- Bhāsa—A study—A. D. Pusalker, Lahore, 1940.
- Bhāsa—A.S.P. Ayyar, Madras, Indian Men of Letters Series, 1957.
- Bhoja's Śṛṅgāra-Prakāśa—Dr. V. Raghavan, 1963.
- Comparative Aesthetics (Vol. I)—Dr. K. C. Pandey, 1951.
- Contribution to the History of the Hindu Drama—Dr. Manomohan Ghosh, Calcutta, 1958.

- Drama in Sanskrit Literature—R. V. Jagirdar, 1947.
- History of Classical Sanskrit Literature—M. Krishnama-
chariar, Madras, 1937.
- History of Sanskrit Poetics—Mm, P. V. Kane (Latest edition).
- History of Sanskrit Poetics—Dr. S. K. De, Calcutta, 1960.
- Indian Theatre—Dr. C.B. Gupta, 1954.
- Kāvya-Vicāra—Dr. S. N. Dasgupta (second print), Calcutta.
- Nāṭya-śāstra (Eng. Tra.)—Dr. M. Ghosh, Bibliotheca Indica,
No. 272, Calcutta.
- Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa (Eng. Tra)—Transactions of the
American Philosophical Society, New Series—Volume 50,
pt. 9, Philadelphia, 1960.
- Philosophy of Poetry—Dr. N. N. Chowdhury, 1959.
- Political History of Ancient India—Dr. H. Roychoudhury,
Calcutta University, 5th ed., 1950.
- Some Concepts of Alāṅkāra-śāstra—Dr. V. Raghavan, Adyar,
1942.
- Some old Lost Rāma Plays—Dr. V. Raghavan, Annamalai
University, 1961.
- Some Problems of Indian Literature—M. Winternitz, Calcutta
University, 1925.
- Some Problems of Sanskrit Poetics—Dr. S. K. De, Calcutta,
1959.
- Sanskrit Drama : Its Origin and Decline—Dr. I. Shekhar,
Leiden, 1960.
- Technique of Sanskrit Drama—Dr. K. K. Datta Sastri
(shortly to be published).
- The Laws and Practice of Sanskrit Drama—Dr. S. N. Sastri,
1961.
- The number of Rasas—Dr. V. Raghavan, Madras, 1940.
- The Sanskrit Drama—A. B. Keith, 1959.
- The Social Play in Sanskrit—Dr. V. Raghavan, The Indian
Institute of Culture, Bangalore, 1952.
- The Theory of the Sandhis and Sandhyangas—Dr. T. G.
Mainkar, 1960.

The Theatre of the Hindus—H. H. Wilson, Ed. Dr. V. Raghavan and others.

II. Journals etc.

Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute

- Vol. XV. 1933-34, pp. 89-96 : Ādibharata and the Nāṭyasarvasvadīpikā, Manomohan Ghosh.
 „ XVI. Pts. 3-4, p. 313f. Subhūticandra's Com. on Amarakośa, P. K. Gode.
 „ XIX. 1938, pt. 3, pp. 280-288, Date of the Nāṭakalakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa, P. K. Gode.
 „ XXXV. 1954, pp. 122-128. The Dramatic terms : A. Praveśaka and Viṣkambhaka, B. Janāntika and Apavāritaka, R. D. Karmarkar.
 „ XLV. 1964, pts. 1-4, Ancient Drama and Music, R. B. Athavale.
 „ „ 1964, pts. 1-4, Abhinava-gupta's division of Arthaprakṛtis : An Interpretation, H. K. Trivedi.

Brahma-Vidya, Adyar Library Bulletin.

- Vol. XVIII, Some corrections to the Abhinava-bhāratī, Dr. V. Raghavan.

Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, London Institute.

- Vol. VI, 1930-32, P. 819f. Nāndī, A Note, K. R. Pisharoti.
 Indian Historical quarterly.

- Vol. V. 1929, pp. 549-552, A Note on the Bharata-Vākya, Chintaharan Chakrabarti.

- „ VI. 1930, pp. 485-486, Bharata-vākya, Manomohan Ghosh.

- Vol. VII, 1931, pp. 190-191, A further note on Bharata-vākya, Chintaharan Chakrabarti.

Vol. VII, 1931. The Problem of the Mahānāṭaka, Dr. S. K. De.

„ X. 1934, pp. 493-508. The Mahānāṭaka problem. Sivaprasad Bhattacharyya.

Journal Asiatique, Paris

Vol. XCIII, Octobre-Decembre, 1923, Le Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa, Sylvain Levi.

Journal of the Department of Letters, Calcutta.

Vol. XXV. 1934, pp. 1-52, Date of Bharata-Nāṭyaśāstra, Manomohan Ghosh

Journal of the American Oriental Society

Vol. 27, Second Half, pp. 418-454, Notes on the Mṛcchakatika—A. W. Ryder.

Vols. 20 & 21, pp. 341-359 & 88-108. Time Analysis of Sanskrit Plays—A. V. Williams Jackson.

Journal of the Oriental Research, Institute, Madras.

Vol. II. pp. 118-128. Fragments of Mātrgupta, T. R. Chintamani.

„ VI. pt. IV & Vol. VII. pts. 1-2, The Vṛttis, V. Raghavan.

„ VII. pp. 277-290, Daśarūpaka, V. Raghavan.

„ VIII. pp. 372-380, Subhūticandra's Commentary on the Amarakośa, T. R. Cintamani.

„ VIII. p. 329f. Bahurūpa-miśra's commentary on the Daśarūpaka, V. Raghavan.

„ XV. pp. 69-73, Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa of Śāgarānandin, Dr. V. Raghavan.

Journal of the Oriental Institute, Baroda.

Vol. V. No. 4, The Conception of Sandhis in the Sanskrit Drama, Dr. V. M. Kulkarni.

„ V. No. 3, p. 321f. On Abhinava-bhāratī, Sivaprasad Bhattacharyya.

„ XI. No. 4, A New Play of Aśvaghosa - K. Krishna-moorthy.

„ XIII. Nos. 2-4, Abhinava-bhāratī restored - Dr. V. M. Kulkarni.

- Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, Bombay Branch
No. I, 1925, pp. 126-143, Bhāsa Riddle: A proposed
Solution, V. S. Sukthankar.
- Journal of the University of Gauhati
Vol. III, 1952, pp. 17-33, The Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇaratna-kośa
of Sāgaranandin, Dr. V. Raghavan.
- Our Heritage, Calcutta Sanskrit College
Vol. I, pt. II. Problems of Bharata and Ādi-bharata,
Dr. S. K. De.
„ III, pt. II. Humour and Satire in Indian Literature,
Dr. S. K. De.
„ V, pt. I. Śakāra in Sanskrit Drama, Sivaprasad
Bhattacharyya.
„ „ „ „ Prologues and Epilogues in Sanskrit
Drama, Dr. K. K. Datta Sastri.
„ VII, pt. I. Garbhāṅka - Dr. K. K. Datta Sastri.
„ IX, pt. I. Pūrvaraṅga - Dr. K. K. Datta Sastri.
- Oriental Thought, Nasik.
Vol. I No. I. Problems of Nāndī and Pūrvaraṅga - R. C.
Athavale.
- Proceedings of the All India Oriental Conference
Session VIII. Mysore, 1935, Sec. IV, pp. 264-273. The
Date of Rasārṇava-sudhākara - A. N. Kri-
shna Aiyanger.
- Sāgarikā (Sagar University)
Vol. I, No. I, Nāṭakiyam Itivṛttam, Visvanath Bhatta-
charyya.
„ II, No. IV, Nāyaka-vimarśaḥ. Visvanath Bhattacharyya.
- Samśkrta-Sāhitya-Parīṣat, Calcutta
Octo-Nov., 1960, Aṅkāvatāra-carcā, Dr. K. K. Datta
Sastri.
- The Vikram, Journal of the Vikram University, Ujjain.
Kālidāsa Special Number, 1960. The Fisherman Episode
in the Abhijñānaśakuntalam, Dr. K. K. Datta Sastri.
- A Volume of Indian and Iranian Studies presented to Sir E.
Denison Ross, 1939. Date of Sāgaranandin - M. R. Kavi.

B. C. Law Volume, pt. I, Calcutta

Viśākhadatta - Dr. S. K. De.

Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume, Poona, 1917.

On Mrcchakaṭika - K. C. Mehendale.

Jha Commemoration Volume, 1937.

Aesthetic Satkāryavāda - K. A. Subrahmanya Iyer.

Sukthankar Memorial Edition, Vol. II, Bombay, 1945.

Studies in Bhāsa - V. S. Sukthankar.

INDEX

(i) Works and Authors

The following works and/or authors have been referred to almost in every page :

Nāṭya-śāstra (NŚ) of Bharata

Abhinava-bhāratī (Abhi-bhā) of Abhinava-gupta (Ag.)

Nāṭaka-lakṣaṇa-ratna-kośa (NLRK) of Sāgara-nandin (Sgn.)

Daśa-rūpaka (DR.) with *Avaloka* of Dhanañjaya and Dhanika

Nāṭya-darpaṇa (ND.) of Rāmacandra—Guṇacandra

Bhāva-prakāśana (Bhā-pra.) of Śāradātānaya

Sāhitya-darpaṇa (SD.) of Viśvanātha

Rasārṇava-sudhākara (RS.) of Siṅga-bhūpāla

Nāṭaka-candrikā (NC.) of Rūpa-gosvāmin

Abhidhāna-cintāmaṇi, 263

Abhijñāna-śakuntalam (Abhi-

śaku.), 4, 18, 34, 74, 81,

145, 149, 153, 160, 164,

166, 174, 189, 210, 266,

267, 296, 314

Abhirāma, 307

Abhiṣeka, 297

ABORI, XXXIV, 240

Alaṃkāra-sarvasva, 315

Allarāja, 304

Amarakośa, 263

Amoghavarṣa Māyurāja, 233

Amṛta-manthana, 191

Amṛtānanda, 192

Anangaharṣa Mātrarāja, 258

Anarṅga-rāghava (An-rā.), 82,

164, 244, 262

Anutāpāṅka (an Act of Chalita-

rāma), 273

Artha-dyotāṅkā (Ar-dyo.), 4,

164, 189, 273, 286, 293

Aśmakutṭa, 22, 36, 184, 238,

313

Aśvaghoṣa, 9, 160, 191

Aśvatthāmaṅka (Act III of V-

sa.), 103, 104, 302, 305

Ācārya, XXVIII, 30, 66, 99,

126, 319

Ādi Bharata, 142, 236, 238,

241, 257, 273, 278

Ānanda-vardhana, 259

Bahurūpa-miśra, 174, 180,

182, 230, 309

Bāla-cārīta, 106, 268, 297

- Bāla-rāmāyaṇa*, (Bāl-rā), 127, 179, 268
Bāñālira Itihāsa, 241
Bāmlā-sāhityera Itihāsa, 241
Bharata-bhāṣya, 305
Bharata-kośa (Bhar-ko.), 251
 Bhattacharyya Prof. Sivaprasad, 146, 256
Bhānumatyāṅka (Act II of V-sam.), 99
Bhāsa, 10, 149, 160, 189
Bhīma-vijaya, 62, 254
Bhoja-carita, 146
Bhoja-raja (-deva), 28, 29, 71, 75, 87, 102, 114, 116, 117, 131, 133, 137, 148, 149, 165, 172, 177, 180, 182, 201, 223, 240, 242, 244, 259, 261, 273, 287, 312
Brhat-kathā, 9, 233, 234
Brhat-kathā-mañjarī, 233
Cārāyaṇa, 173, 308
Chalita-rāma, 273
 Cintamani T. R. XXXII
Cūḍāmaṇi-saṃhāra, (Act V of Nāgā), 110
 Dandin, 129
Daśarathāṅka, 136, 291
 Datta Shastri Dr K. K. XX-XIII, 85, 122, 175, 178, 185, 204, 273, 285, 309, 311, 314
 Dattila, 262
Deva-pāṇi, 164
 Dhruva H. K., 47
Dhuṇḍirāja, 49, 89, 127, 145
Dhvanyāloka, 128, 288
 Dillon Prof. M. XXVII, 55
Drauhini, 128
Dvādaśa-sahasrī, 196
 Freytag, G., 83
Ghanaśyāma, 295
Ghaṇṭaka, 10
 Ghosh Dr M. M., 149, 152, 172
 Gode P. K. XXVII
Hemacandra, 259
 HSL. 282
Jagaddhara, 171, 174, 194, 210, 307, 309
 Jagirdar Prof. R. V. 54, 189
Jānaki-pariṇaya, 295
Jānaki-rāghava, 22, 23, 32, 35, 72, 98, 101, 102, 103, 105, 108, 112, 114, 116, 118, 139, 192, 238, 272, 275, 278, 313, 315
 Journal Asiatique, XXVII, XXXIV
 JOI, XXXIII, 239, 248, 250, 264
 JOR. XXXIII, 319
 Journal, University of Gauhati, XXXIV, 312
Kadalī-grha (Act II of Rv.), 99, 102

- Kavi-kaṇṭha-hāra*, 295
Kālidāsa, 8, 10, 100
Kane Mm. P. V. XXVIII, 249
Kāma-sūtra, 308
Kāmadattā-pūrti, 117, 282
Katyavema, 37, 87, 89, 125
Kāvya-mīmāṃsā, 221
Kāvyaadarśa, 289
Keith A. B., 54, 146, 178
Kohala, XXVIII, 35, 37, 88
 147, 170, 172, 176, 180,
 181, 184, 185f., 217f., 243,
 244, 265, 294, 306, 308,
 311, 313, 314
Konesvari ṭikā, XXXIV
Kośalāṅka, 17, 236
Kulapatyaṅka, 19, 44, 237
Kulkarni Dr. V. M., 24, 47,
 54, 264
Kumāra-svāmin, 240
Kumbhāṅka, 297
Kundamālā, 32, 33, 191, 192,
 273, 315
Kuppuswami Com. Vol.
 XXXV
Kuntaka, 259
Kṛtyā-rāvaṇa, 304
Kṣtrasvāmin, 263

Levi Prof. Sylvain, XXVII,
 XXX
Lollaṭa, 91, 129, 143f., 198,
 200, 266, 294
LPSPD.

Madhusūdana, 295
Mahābhāṣya, 191, 315

Mahānāṭaka, 146, 295
Mahārāja (Mg.?), 166
Mainkar Dr T. G., 64, 86, 264,
 284
Mālavikāgnimitra (Mā-ag.), 9,
 37, 88, 125, 175, 178, 192,
 265, 320.
Mālatī-mādhava (Mā-mā), 19,
 39, 43, 88, 174, 179, 181,
 191, 194, 315, 302
Mammata, 259
Mārīca-vañcitaka, 115, 281
Mātrgupta (Mg.), XXIXf.,
 4f., 11, 16f., 19, 21, 22, 23,
 24, 25, 29, 33, 34, 54f., 63,
 65, 70, 72, 78, 79, 129,
 133, 134, 135, 138, 141,
 164, 166, 171, 187, 227,
 232, 239, 242, 245, 248,
 250, 251, 254, 258, 260,
 262, 266, 268, 269, 292,
 304
Māyā-lakṣmanāṅka, 108, 278
Māyā-madālasā, 55f., 147,
 251, 254
Mithyājñāna-vidamvanam, 146
Moharāja-parājaya, 9
Mṛcchakatikam (Mṛccha.), 81,
 82, 150, 160, 192, 291,
 299, 315
Mudrā-rākṣasam (Mu-ra.), 9,
 81, 90, 127, 138, 207, 233,
 313
Nāga-varmāṅka, 308
Nāgānanda (Nāgā.), 35, 82,
 112, 122, 138, 147, 150,
 174

- Nalavijaya*, 297
Nānya-deva, 305
Narahari, 164, 166, 230, 234, 295, 303, 305, 307
Naraka-vadha, 203
Navagraha-carita, 308

 OH. XXXIII, 309, 313

Padma-prābhṛtaka, 282
Palityaṅka (Act IV of RV.) 280
Pārvaṭi-Pariṇaya, 149
Pisharoti K. R. 316
Pitāmaha, 7, 230
 PHAI. 233, 234
Prabodha-candrodaya, 9
Prajāpati, 2, 230
Pratāparudra-yaśo-bhūṣaṇa (PRYB.), 127
Pratimā-nāṭakam, 297
Pratimāniruddha, 132
Prāvṛḍaṅka, 297
Priyadarśikā, 178
Puṃśavanāṅka (Act I of *Chalita-rāma*), 101, 273

Rāghava-bhaṭṭa (RB.), XXIX
 5, 33, 49, 87, 89, 102, 121, 125, 133, 135, 138, 141, 145, 164, 188, 227, 236, 238, 242, 243, 247, 248, 257, 287, 295, 303, 306
Rāghavan Dr. V. XXVII, 6, 54, 96, 127, 129, 133, 166, 171, 174, 176, 198, 227, 260, 269, 290, 319

Rāghavābhudaya, 16, 35, 76, 121, 206, 236, 243
Raivati-pariṇaya, 166, 304
Rājaśekhara, 223, 268
Rāja-taraṅginī (R-t.), 166,
Rāmābhinanda, 307
Rāmābhyudya, 132
Ramakrishna Kavi, XXXI
Rāmānanda, 191, 307, 315
Rāma-vikrama, 100, 272
Raṅganātha, XXIX. 164, 242, 303
Rasa-candrikā (Ra-ca.), 189, 192, 307, 320
Rasaratna-pradipikā, 304
Ratnakośa, 232
Ratnāvalī (R-v.), 34, 65, 69, 80, 100, 104, 107, 113, 118, 119, 126, 139, 176, 279
Ravidāsa, 146
Rucipati, 38, 164, 171, 192, 230, 243, 297, 303, 307, 314
Rudraṭa, 219

Sampātyaṅka, 105, 107, 276
Saṅgita-kalpataru, 164, 303
Saṅgita-dāmodara (saṅ-dā.), XXXf. 55, 60, 82, 131, 164, 171, 223, 253, 262, 289, 302
Saṅkalpa-sūryodaya, 9
Samketāṅka (Act III of R-v.), 103, 109
 SOLRP. 272, 276, 304
Sarvānanda, XXXI, 262

- Satya-hariścandra*, 80
Sarasvatī-kaṇṭābharaṇa, 201
Sāgarikā, 11
Sāhasāṅkiya-tikā (on DR.), 164
 SCAS. 289
Subandhu, 128, 129
Sugrīvāṅka, 20, 134
Svopnā-vāsavadattā, 9
Śat-sahasrī (NS), 196
Śakaligarbha, 200f.
Śaktyāṅka, 165, 304
Śāṅkara, 2, 166, 171, 189, 192,
 210, 230, 231, 234
Śāṅkuka, 68, 75, 78, 108, 257,
 259, 260, 277, 305
Śatī-kāmadattā, 166, 304
Śārīputra-prakarāṇa, 9, 10, 191,
 192
Sastri Dr S. N., 13, 14, 139,
 140, 199, 308
Śivarāma, 122
Śubhāṅkara, XXXf. 164, 168,
 288, 290, 307
Śrīharṣa, 178
Śrīgāra-prakāśa (Śr-pra), 27,
 139, 170, 177, 179, 249,
 257, 259, 265, 271, 272,
 275, 277, 280, 281, 284,
 289, 303, 307, 319
Tarkavācaspati Tārānātha,
 308, 255, 292
Tāpasa-vatsarāja, 72, 244, 258, 261.
Tikā-sarvasva (Ti-sar.). XXIX.
 262
Tripura-daha, 191
 The Skt. Dra. 295
 Theory of Sandhi and San-
 dhyāga (TSS.) 264
Udātta-rāghava, 132, 237, 297
Udbhaṭa, 75, 78, 125, 198f.,
 200, 286
Upādhyāya (Tauta), 231, 250
Urubhaṅga, 194
Uttara-rāma-caritām (U-ca.),
 33, 83, 153, 155, 179, 187,
 268, 273, 300, 314
Vakula-vīthi, 194
Vāsudeva, XXIX.
Velankar Dr H. D. XXXIV
Vidyānātha, 126, 175, 315
Vikramovvaśīya (Vik-u), 82,
 164
Viddha-śālabhaṅjikā, 149, 153
Viśākhadatta, 10, 27, 51, 234
Viṣṇudharmottara-purāṇa
 (VDP), 169, 221, 234, 306
Viṣṇu-purāṇa, 234
Vedānta-vāgīśa, 146
Veṇī-saṃhāra (V-sam.), 22,
 30f., 34, 35, 39, 40, 44, 66,
 67, 68, 76, 82, 93, 94, 98,
 104, 105, 109, 110, 111,
 112, 113, 117, 119, 120,
 124, 126, 128, 132, 138,
 145, 147, 149, 167, 242,
 245, 256, 266, 267, 286,
 296.

INDEX

(ii) *Dramaturgical Terms & Expressions*
(Arranged in Sanskrit alphabetical order)

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>Aṅka, 143f.
Aṅka-mukha (Aṅkāśya), 147, 179f.
Aṅkāvatāra, 147, 173f., 175f.
Adhibala, 106
Anumāna, 105, 275
Anuyoga, 118
Anu-sandhi, 91f., 129, 266
Anu-sarpaṇa, 274
Anyāya-vṛtti, 200
Apavāda, 108
Abhinaya, 1, 224f.
Abhūtodāharana, 104
Artha, 29, 33, 64, 78, 115
Artha-prakṛti, 7, 26f., 84
Artha-bīja, 33f.
Artha-vṛtti, 199
Arthopakṣepaka, 163f. 188
Arthopasthāpana, 241
Avapāta, 214
Avamarśa (Vimarśa), 73f.
Avasthā, 16f., 84

Ākāśa-vacana, 133, 135, 290
Ākṣipti, 276
Ākṣepa, 123
Āgantuka-bhāva, 136</p> | <p>Ātma-samvitti-vṛtti, 200
Ātāna, 280
Ādāna, 113
Ādhikārika-vṛtta, 26, 38
Ānanda, 118
Āmukha, 203
Ārabhaṭi-vṛtti, 212f.
Āraṁbha, 17f.
Ārṣa, 6, 9, 10

Īhāmṛga, 298

Utkṣipta (Ākṣipti), 106
Utthāpaka, 205
Udātta, 12f., 15
Udātta-vacana, 165, 167, 305
Udbheda, 96
Udvega, 107
Udāharana, 104
Upakṣepa, 30f., 93
Upakṣepa (Sandhyaṅga), 132
Upagūhana (Parigūhana, Upagūḍha), 119
Upacāra, 14
Upa-nāyaka, 39f.
Upanyāsa, 101
Upasarpa, 270, 274
Upātta, 5f.</p> |
|---|--|

- Autukya, 18
 Kaiśiki-vṛtti, 99, 207f.
 Kakṣyā, 160
 Kathā-bhāga, 300
 Karuṇa, 216
 Kalpya, 2
 Kārya, 44f., 247
 Kārya-dina, 167, 300
 Kāryāvasthā, 7, 48
 Kāvya-saṃhāra, 120, 122
 Krama, 104, 275
 Krodhaja-vimarśa, 76
 Kṛti (Dyuti), 117

 Khaṇḍa-cūlikā, 184
 Kheda, 111
 Khyatativṛtta, 5

 Garbha-nāṭaka, 178
 Garbhāṅka, 173f.
 Garbha-sandhi (acc. to Mg.), 58f.
 Garbha-sandhi (acc. to the NŚ.), 70f., 86, 257, 274f.
 Gopucchāgra, 83f.
 Grathana, 115, 282

 Cūḍāṅka, 147
 Cūlikā (Cūḍā, Cūlā), 183f. 312f.
 Chāyā, 30f.

 Tāpa, 271
 Tāpana, 99, 271
 Tulya-viśeṣaṅka, 137
 Tulya-saṃvidhāṅka, 137

 Toṭaka, 106
 Trivarga, 65

 Daśā (theory), 129
 Dima, 315
 Drava, 109
 Dṛṣṭa-naṣṭa, 66f.
 Dṛśyādṛśya, 69
 Dṛśya-śravya, 189
 Dyuti, 111
 Dhīra-lalita, 13f.
 Dhīra-prasānta, 13f.
 Dīrodātta, 13f.
 Dhīroddhata, 13f.
 Dhūnana, 270

 Narma, 99, 127, 208
 Narma-garbha, 210, 214
 Narma-dyuti, 100, 127
 Narma-sphunja (-sphañjas
 Nspññja, sphūrja), 211
 Narma-sphoṭa, 209
 Nāṭaka, 1, 2, 3f.
 Nāṭakiya-vastu-svabhāva, 30
 Nāṭya, 1, 2f.
 Nāṭya-vyāpāra, 198
 Nāndī, 203
 Nāyaka, 147, 296
 Nirṇaya, 611
 Nirodha, 118
 Niyatā Phalaprapṭi (Niyatā-
 pti), 21f., 36
 Nirvahaṇa-sandhi (acc. to
 Mg.), 60, 78f.
 Nirvahaṇa-sandhi (acc. to the
 NŚ.), 86, 281f.

- Nepathya-vacana, 133, 135, 290.
 Nyāya-vṛtti, 200
 Patākā-nāyaka, 39f., 46, 75, 91, 150
 Patākā-vṛtta, 38f., 244
 Patākā-sthānaka, 36f.
 Parikara, 94
 Parijana, 165
 Paribhāvana, 96
 Paribhāṣaṇa, 116
 Parinyāsa, 94
 Parivartak, 205
 Parisarpa, 98
 Paryupāsana, 101
 Pusta, 160, 213
 Puṣpa, 101
 Pūrṇa, 129
 Pūrṇa-vṛtti, 4
 Pūrṇa-sandhi, 4
 Pūrṇāṅga-rūpaka, 53
 Pūrva-raṅga, 203, 227, 302
 Pūrva-vākya, 120, 284
 Prakaraṇa, 2
 Prakārī-nāyaka, 46
 Prakārī-vṛtta, 38, 41, 44, 247
 Prakhyāta, 2f., 8, 10
 Prakhyāta-vastu, 13
 Pragamana, 100, 274
 Pragyana, 217
 Pradhāna, 40
 Pradhāna-phala, 65
 Pradhānārtha, 115
 Prayatna, 19
 Pratimukha-sandhi (acc. to Mg.) 57f.
 Pratimukha-sandhi (acc. to NŚ.), 66, 86, 97, 255, 270f.
 Prati-nāyaka, 39f.
 Pratisaṃskṛta, 4, 5, 6f.
 Pratiṣedha, 112
 Prarocanā, 114, 203
 Praveśaka, 163f., 300
 Prahāsana, 203
 Prasamana, 271, 274
 Prasasti, 221f.
 Prasānta, 129
 Prasaṅga, 110
 Prasāda (Upasti), 117
 Prastāvanā, 203, 227, 267
 Prāgbhāva, 284
 Prāpti, 95
 Prāpti-sambhava (Prāptyāśā), 20f.
 Prāthanā, 105, 123
 Prāsāṅgika (ānusaṅgika)-vṛtta, 26, 38, 52
 Phala, 24, 32, 34, 45
 Phala-bija, 33f.
 Phala-yoga, 16, 23f. 44
 Phala-hetavaḥ, 29, 32, 46
 Phala-saṃvitti-vṛtti, 200
 Phalāgama, 47
 Bija, 17, 29f., 241
 Bija-nyāsa, 32
 Bijārtha, 73
 Bindu, 34f., 66, 243, 294
 Bibhatsa, 216
 Bharata-vākya, 121, 285

- Bhārati-vṛtti, 202f., 218
 Bhāṣaṇa, 119
 Bhāsvara, 129
 Bhāva-mātreṇa, 20
 Bhāvena, 21
 Bhayānaka, 216
 Bheda, 97

 Mārga, 103
 Miśra, 2f.
 Mukha-sandhi (acc. to Mg.),
 55
 Mukha-sandhi (acc. to the
 NŚ.), 64f. 86, 254, 266f.

 Yavanikā, 159
 Yukti, 95, 104, 114

 Riti, 221
 Rūpa, 103, 275
 Raudra, 216

 Lakṣyālakṣya, 69
 Lakṣya-lakṣaṇa (verses), 269
 Lalita, 129
 Lāsyāṅga, 125
 Lekha, 133, 290
 Lekhyokti, 133, 290

 Vajra, 101
 Vandin, 183
 Varṇa-saṃhāra, 102
 Vastu, 33
 Vastu-bīja, 33f.
 Vastūttahāpana, 214
 Vicalana, 114

 Vidrava, 107, 109, 126, 297,
 299
 Vidhāna, 96
 Vidhūta, 99, 271
 Vimarśa, 259
 Vimarśa-sandhi (acc. to Mg.)
 59
 Vimarśa-sandhi (acc. to the
 NŚ.), 86, 78f.
 Vipadantaranirmāṇa, 80f.
 Vibodha, 119
 Vivalana, 281
 Vyavasāya, 110
 Vyāhāra, 114, 139
 Virodha, 100, 119
 Virodhana, 112
 Vilāsa, 98, 223
 Vilobhana, 94, 270
 Vithi, 139, 203
 Vira, 216
 Viṣkambhaka, 69f., 306f.
 Vṛtti, 197f. 316f.
 Vṛtyaṅga, 202f.

 Hāsyā, 216
 Hina-sandhi, 85

 Śakti, 109
 Śabda-vṛtti, 199
 Śānta, 216
 Śuddhā-kaiśiki, 209
 Śrṅgāra, 216
 Śleṣa, 30f.

 Sadasya, 313
 Sandehālāṅkāra, 275

- | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Sandhi, 7, 49f., 84, 281 | Samyogavihita-narma, 209 |
| Sandhyaṅga, 93f. | Samlāpa (Sallāpa), 206 |
| Sandhyantara (Pradeśa), 125, | Samādhāna, 95 |
| 129, 131f. 187 | Sāṅghātya (Sāṅghātyaka), 206 |
| Samagra, 129 | Sādana (Chādana, Chalana), |
| Samavakāra, 315 | 113 |
| Samaya, 118 | Sādhyādi-paṅcaka, 62f |
| Samkṣiptaka, 212 | Sāttvati-vrtti, 204f. |
| Samgraha, 104, 119 | Sūcya, 189 |
| Sampheta, 109, 126, 215 | |

CORRIGENDA

Page	Line	Read	For
1	5	of poetical	of the poetical
1	6	<i>abhinēya</i>	<i>abhināya</i>
1	6	śravya. The	śravya the
2	15-16	on the subject takes up Nāṭaka	on Nāṭaka
2	27-28	sources, it	sources. It
4	12	source	force
7	17	poet	Poet
7	32	śāstra	śāstras
8	8	please	places
8	30	being 35	being 25
9	14	personages	Personages
9	26	Prakaraṇa	prakaraṇa
10	15	<i>ārṣa</i>	<i>arṣa</i>
10	32	<i>vartamāna</i>	<i>vartamana</i>
11	4	kings	Kings
14	26	types,	types
15	22-23	origin, probably Vaiṣṇavism. Nāṭya	origin. Probably Vaiṣṇavism Nāṭya
18	5	<i>śakuntala</i> 8	<i>śakuntala</i>
18	32	Nāṭya	nāṭya
21	24	visualised as an	visualised an
24	20	Abhinavagupta	Abhinavaguptabhārati
26	17	not so	not to
26	29	Kārya	Karya
28	12	what	that
28	16	has got	has not got
29	22	seed	seeds
29	24	<i>kāraṇam</i>	<i>karaṇam</i>
29	26	Phalayoga	phalayoga
30	26	<i>āha</i>	<i>aha</i>
33	34	conclusion	conclusions
36	3	hosts, Kumbha	hosts. Kumbha-
37	15	Śāradā	Sāradā
38	8	Rucipati	Ricipati
38	32	<i>prakāśayati</i> 2	<i>prakāśayati</i>
39	2	-sudhākara 4	-sudhākara

Page	Line	Read	For
39	11	quotes 5	quotes
39	33	Śāradā-	Śāradā-
41	9	drama is a	drama a
41	19	desire 12	desire 22
41	27	<i>sugrivādeḥ</i>	<i>sugrivādeḥ</i>
45	26	The	the
46	28	<i>Abhinava-bhārati</i>	<i>Abhinavagupta</i>
47	3	kathā	katha
48	8	of a particular	of particular
48	23	Prakari	Brakari
51	11	Samiddhārthaka	Samiddharthaka
53	26	Bhāṇa	Bhaṇa
55	17	- <i>dāmodarā</i>	- <i>dāmadara</i>
56	25	reference to	reference to
61	11	Aṅka and each, the	Aṅka the
61	17	Gālava	Galava
61	21	Menakā	Menaka
63	37	to be an alternative method and not a substitute to the elaborate	to be elaborate
65	15	- <i>sudhākara</i> 6	- <i>sudhākara</i>
68	12	- <i>saṃhāra</i>	- <i>saṃhāra</i>
71	5	- <i>śāstra, prāpti</i>	- <i>śāstra prāpti</i>
101	38	consists in	consists i
105	33	<i>cāṅgam</i>	<i>caṅgam</i>
106	3	Abhinavagupta, Ākṣipti	Abhinavagupta. Akṣipti
106	27	Toṭaka	Totaka
107	32	<i>Sampātya</i> —	<i>Sompātya</i> —
110	1	interpretes	interpret
113	36	Chādana	Chālana
115	17	ANGAS NĪRVAHAṆA	ANGAS NĪRVAHANA
116	1	to different	different
117	12	jealousy	jealous
119	15	characteristic	haracteristic
122	23	same 2	same 3
124	31	So far	Sa far
125	4	particular	Particular
126	34	Śāradātanaya 18	Śārādatanaya
133	26	<i>sandhyayaḥ</i>	<i>sandhyayaḥ</i>
149	2	incidents	incident
152	23	<i>kvacit</i> 52	<i>kvacit</i>
156	35	Act, it	Act. It

Page	Line	Read	For
158	5	concludes	conclude
159	6	characters	characters
161	19	are of	are o
167	10	Abhinava 32	Abhinava
171	20	Jagaddhara	Jagadhara
177	34	Aṅkāvatāra 29	Aṅkāvatāra
180	18	up	us
187	14	in	in
191	36	Vastu 3	Vastu
191	36	nirdeśa	nirddśa
192	10	-etareṇa vā	-etareṇa va
199	12	Śabda	Sabda
199	15	ārabhaṭim	ārabhatim
199	31	murchā	mūrcha
201	3	-bhārati	-bhārati
201	29	Śṛṅgāra-	śrṅgāra
223	7	kathitā	kathita
236	22	SD	S.D
246	16	patākāyāḥ	putākāyah
251	20	removed	remove
254	10	author. Like	author, like
254	26	ke'pi	kecit
255	5	second foot	underlined portions
257	16 & 17	Bhā-pra	Bha-pra
265	27	abhāvastu	abhavāstu
267	33	khyasy-	khysy-
276	19	arīśabdān-	arīśabdan-
293	34	to Ādi-bharata in the	to the
304	35	nothing	nothing

Kushana State and Indian Society

A study in Post-Mauryan Polity and Society

by

Dr Bhaskar Chattopadhyay, M.A., Ph. D. (Cal.)

C O N T E N T S

Introduction
Chapter I : Population
Chapter II : Territory
Chapter III : Sovereignty
Chapter IV : Government
Chapter V : State in relation to Dharma
Chapter VI : Society and Polity
Appendix A : State in Manava Dhamasastra
Appendix B : Some Important Inscription of the post-Maurya period bearing on Indian Polity
Appendix C : Inscriptions on Kushana Coins
Select Bibliography

In Press, Shortly out Price approx—Rs. 80.00